

The Classical Review

APRIL 1891.

NOTES ON HORACE,

SAT. 1. 3. 7, 8; 1. 10. 64-67. A. P. 252-254; 319-322.

I PLACE these passages together because each of them admits of a simple and natural interpretation and all of them have been rendered difficult and perplexing by the ingenuity of commentators.

The first is the well-known passage—

modo summa

Voce, modo hac resonat quae chordis quatuor
ima.

Orelli, following Gesner and followed, I am sorry to see, by Professor Palmer, insists that *summa vox* must be the sound corresponding with the *ὑπάτη χορδή* of the Greek lyre, that is, a bass or low-pitched voice, and similarly that *ima vox* must be the sound corresponding with the *νήτη χορδή*, that is, a treble or high-pitched voice. Professor Palmer says: 'The Greeks and Romans reversed our system. The old simple tetra-chord had four strings, *νήτη*, *παρὰνήτη*, *παρ-ὑπάτη*, *ὑπάτη*: of these the highest string, *ὑπάτη* *summa*, was the most bass; the lowest, *νήτη*, *ima*, was the most treble.' And with considerable ingenuity he proposes to alter *quae* into *qua* e to suit this view.

I do not know what authority Professor Palmer has for saying that 'highest,' 'summa,' 'ὑπάτη,' are interchangeable expressions, as applied to strings: I certainly have not been able to find any. If by 'highest' and 'summa' he means the highest in position, as the lyre is held by the player, the expression is to me unintelligible. For the lyre was held upright, or nearly so; and the bass string was no higher than the treble

string. Neither do I understand how the Greeks and Romans 'reversed our system,' for our harp-strings are also upright or nearly so when the harp is played, and I do not see how one string can be called higher or lower in position than another.

Even if it could be proved that *summa* was ever used as equivalent to *ὑπάτη*, it must be remembered that Horace is speaking here of a *summa vox*, not of a *summa chorda*, and the expression 'modo *summa voce*' is used before any mention has been made of strings at all, and is complete in itself.

But there is positive evidence that *summa vox* means a high-pitched voice, and *ima vox* a low-pitched voice. Quintilian says (11. 3. 41): 'Neque gravissimus autem in musica sonus nec acutissimus orationibus convenit. Nam et hic parum clarus nimiumque plenus nullum afferre animis motum potest, et ille praetenuis et immodicae claritatis, cum est ultra verum, tum neque pronuntiatione flecti neque diutius ferre intentionem potest. Nam vox, ut nervi, quo remissior hoc gravior et plenior; quo tensor hoc tenuis et acuta magis est. Sic *ima vim* non habet, *summa rumpi periclitatur*.' This passage is quite conclusive as to the meaning of *summa* and *ima* as applied to the voice.

We have also positive evidence as to the meaning of *ὑπάτη*. It does not mean 'highest,' but 'leading,' or 'most important.' The Latin word used by writers on music to translate it is not *summa* but *principalis*. Boetius says (*Inst. Mus.* 1. 20): 'Inque his (chordis) quae gravissima quidem erat, vocata est hypate, quasi major atque honorabilior,

unde Jovem etiam hypaton vocant. Consulem quoque eodem nuncupant nomine propter excellentiam dignitatis.' And Martianus Capella says (9. 941): 'quasi cujusdam rectoris nomen accepit.' It is almost unnecessary to add that if *summa* does not correspond with ὑπάτη, *ima* certainly does not correspond with ῥήτη, which is always rendered by 'ultima,' and it is so called quia in tetrachordo finem tenet.

I conclude that *summa* when applied to musical sounds, whether produced by the voice or by strings, can only mean high-pitched (including also the meaning 'loud'), and similarly *ima* can only mean low-pitched: and Horace's expression means simply, 'now in a shrill treble, now in a deep bass.' Chordis I take to be the dative, and resonat to mean 'answers,' or 'sings in accompaniment to' the lyre (just as in *Sat.* 1. 4. 76 *voei resonat* means 'answers,' or 'rings in echo to' the voice), and the whole expression 'resonat quae chordis quatuor' means nothing more than that Horace is describing a musician's voice as used in singing, and not an ordinary voice as used in speaking.

The second passage is the one relating to Lucilius—

Fuerit Lucilius, inquam,
Comis et urbanus, fuerit limator idem
Quam rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor,
Quamque poetarum seniorum turba.

I understand the meaning of this passage to be:—Granted that Lucilius was genial and witty, granted that even in style he was more polished than the writers who used the old rude Saturnian measure, which was unknown to the Greeks, or than the earlier poets, properly so called (that is, those who used Greek metres). This explanation of the passage seems so obvious that I suppose its very simplicity has caused it to be overlooked. *Rudis* is a word very applicable to the Saturnian measure. Auctor I understand in a collective sense of the writers of Saturnian verse, as opposed to the poetae, who were ποιηταί, that is, framers of metrical verses on Greek models. If any one prefers to translate auctor, 'originator,' it would, I suppose, refer to Livius Andronicus. But if so, it would have been more natural for Horace to mention him by name. It seems to me impossible that Horace should have used the word *carminis* of satirical composition, but he does several times (e.g. *Ep.* 1. 19. 27) use it simply of metre. We might parallel the passage by supposing Pope to give Skelton credit not only for excellence as a satirist, but also for smoother versification

than Langland, who wrote in the old English alliterative rhythm, or than Chaucer, who followed the Italian models.

The third passage is the one in which Horace describes the iambic trimeter.

unde etiam trimetris accrescere jussit
Nomen iambeis, cum senos redderet ictus
Primus ad extremum similis sibi.

The difficulty of this passage has been entirely created by making trimetris the predicate instead of iambeis. If iambeis is made the predicate of trimetris all difficulty vanishes. The question is what is the meaning of 'unde.' Those who make a puzzle of the passage consider that *unde* refers only to the two preceding words, *pes citus*. But I do not see why *unde* should not refer to the whole preceding sentence, and especially to the words *vocatur iambus*. I would understand the passage thus: 'Hence (that is, because this foot is called an iambus) the tragic trimeter, at the time when it consisted, as it did originally, of six iambeis, was further defined as an iambic trimeter, and the name iambic still remains although the verse is no longer a pure iambic verse.' If any one objects that this is too simple, I would ask—Can anything be too simple for the previous line, *syllaba longa brevi, &c.*?

I do not go into the question of non ita pridem, which I do not think is at all important. Nor is it very important whether Horace is right or wrong in his statement that the tragic trimeter was originally a pure iambic trimeter. It is at any rate theoretically not improbable.

The fourth passage consists of the following lines:—

Interdum speciosa locis morataque recte
Fabula, nullius veneris, sine pondere et arte,
Valdius oblectat populum meliusque moratur
Quam versus inopes rerum nugaeque canorae.

Here a difficulty has been created by forcing an unnatural meaning upon the words *morataque recte*—a meaning quite at variance with the next words, *nullius veneris sine pondere et arte*. If *recte morata* is understood in its natural and ordinary sense of 'virtuous,' 'moral' (*fabula* being of course personified), there is no contradiction whatever and the statement is true. But can *morata recte* mean what the scholiast says: 'in qua mores singularum personarum optime exprimuntur'? I do not think so. Certainly the passages quoted in the lexicons do not establish it. The most important one is

from Quintilian (4. 2. 64). In this passage Quintilian lays down that narratio should be aperta, brevis, credibilis. He admits that Cicero, in addition to these qualities 'vult esse evidentem, moratam, cum dignitate.' And upon this he remarks, 'sed in oratione morata debent esse omnia cum dignitate quae poterunt.' It is not quite clear what are the words of Cicero which Quintilian summarises by the adjective moratam, but probably they are the following: 'si res et ad eorum qui agent naturam et ad vulgi morem et ad eorum qui audient opinionem accommodabitur' (Inv. 1. 29). And if so I believe the word 'natural' will almost exactly represent what Quintilian means by moratam. If he had meant 'with the characters accurately drawn,' he could hardly have used the word in the next sentence (sed in oratione, &c.) in which he criticises Cicero; for this criticism can only mean:—But this is not only true of narratio; all parts of an orator's speech must be

morata cum dignitate, including exordium, refutatio, &c. (in which there is no room for character-painting at all).

Those who interpret moratam 'with the characters well drawn' would, I suppose, understand Quintilian to be referring to *de Orat.* 2. 328: Sed et festivitatem habet narratio distincta personis et interpuncta sermonibus. But the emphatic words in this sentence are et festivitatem habet, and if this had been in Quintilian's mind he would certainly have used festivus, not moratus. But whatever view we may take of Quintilian's words they do not affect the expression in Horace, which is not morata, but recte morata, and which can hardly have any other meaning here than that which it has in Plaut. *Aul.* 2. 2. 62.

G. S. SALE,

Otago University,
New Zealand.

HORATIANA.

CARM. ii. 11. 21—24.

Quis devium scortum eliciet domo
Lyden? Eburna dic age cum lyra
Maturet in comptum Lacaeanae
More comas religata nodum.

I approach this passage not so much with the hope of proposing a satisfactory emendation, as for the purpose of impeaching the ordinary text, which cannot in my opinion be sound. This is the only passage in the *Odes* where *scortum* occurs. I do not believe Horace wrote it here. Horace avoided all vulgar expressions in his *Odes*. He refused admission even to diminutives. Is it possible that in one of the most refined of all his *Odes* he introduced one of the lowest terms in the Latin language? The situation is this. Horace invites a friend whose youth like his own is passed, from whom as from himself *canities* is banishing *lascivos amores facilemque somnum*, to feast with him on the grass under the shade of a pine or plane by a running brook: and in thought he bids one slave temper the wine, another to go for a music girl, without whose dancing and singing no such feast would be complete. All runs smooth and graceful until we are confronted with the hateful *scortum*. And the expression is as prosaic as it is coarse. I am

sure there is not such a conjunction in the *Odes* of Horace as *devium scortum Lyden*, which reads more like an entry in the censor's books than a poetic description: Name, *Lyde*: Profession, *scortum*: Remarks, *devium*. And what may *devium* mean? According to Stephens it means: 'vulgare et nimis prostitutum.' According to Orelli it means the exact opposite: 'non vulgare nec nimis prostitutum, in recessu aliquo habitans.' It was but a step farther to render *devium* 'coy.' 'Coy *scortum*' is good. Ritter, followed by Mr. Wickham, makes *devium* proleptic: 'lure hither to our retreat.' There are other methods proposed, but these three will suffice to show the difficulty of the passage independent of the primary fatal blemish, viz. the word *scortum* itself.

How does Horace describe Neaera whom he sends for in similar fashion to grace his banquet, iii. 14. 21? Not by naming her profession, which it was unnecessary to specify, for that it was that of a music girl every reader would understand, but by the addition of an epithet of praise, *argutae* 'tuneful.' And that Lyde was here described by some epithet of praise is, in my opinion, most indubitable. The word *eliciet* denotes that Lyde was a singing girl of superior quality, who set high value on her accomplishments. A word that describes an accomplished

elegant and beautiful lady, and is not far from *scortum*, is *scitam*.

Quis devia *scitam* eliciet domo
Lyden?

'Who will lure accomplished Lyde from her retired home?' It may be objected to *scitam* that this adjective, a favourite with Plautus and Terence, smacks too much of the language of ordinary life to be admitted into the *Odes* of Horace: but in the sense of 'witty,' 'clever,' applied to sayings, it is not uncommon in Cicero: and Ovid has, *Fast.* 5. 54, *curvae scita Thalia lyrae*, where, as here, it is especially applied to an accomplished performer on the lyre.

A (Parisinus) omits *scortum* altogether *ma.pr.* If this indicates that the word was absent from the archetype, it opens the door to all sorts of conjecture to fill the gap: and the question would be, what word would most likely have fallen out: *flavam* perhaps: but inasmuch as all other MSS. contain the word *scortum* it seems that its omission in A was a mere accident. Most likely there was in some early MS. a marginal gloss, *scortum*, written by some *ineptus*, which expelled the true reading.

CARM. iii. 8. 25—28.

Negligens, ne qua populus laboret,
Parce privatus nimium cavere, et
Dona praesentis cape laetus horae et
Linque severa.

Madvig was so perplexed by the construction by which *negligens* and *parce* must both go with *cavere*, or else *negligens* and *cavere* must both go with *ne laboret* (and *negligere ne* is not a good construction), that he actually proposed to join *negligens* with *populus*, 'the negligent crowd.' But *parte* for *parce*, an emendation which I find anticipated by Bonfinius, and well known in the last century, though, it seems, totally forgotten in this, is, I think, the true reading. Cf. Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* vii. 67: si qua in *parte* nostri *laborare*, aut gravius premi videbantur. *Sat.* i. 2. 38: ut omni *parte* *laborent*. *Parte* and *parce* are, in cursives, practically the same word. The construction is 'Negligens cavere, ne qua parte populus laboret.'

CARM. iii. 24. 1—8.

Intactis opulentior
Thesauris Arabum et divitis Indiae
Caementis licet occupes
Tyrrhenum omne tuis et mare Apulicum

Si figit adamantinos
Summis verticibus dira Necessitas
Clavos, non animum metu
Non mortis laqueis expedies caput.

I have printed above in the fourth verse the reading adopted by Orelli, *Apulicum*, which may be called the vulgate. *Apulicum* has however less support from MSS. than either of two other readings, and there are two other grave objections to it. The first is the shortening of the first syllable which is only defended by iii. 4, 10, *Nutricis extra limen Apuliae*, a reading equally doubtful with this: the best MSS. giving *limina Pulliae*, and the previous line flatly contradicting *Apuliae*: hence the best critics have given various conjectures for *Apuliae*: as *Daurinae*, Ritter: *villulae*, Madvig: *pergulae* Housman. Secondly, the sense is against *Apulicum*: there were no towns on the Adriatic sea where it was fashionable to build villas half or wholly in the sea.

The other two readings which contend with *Apulicum* are *Ponticum* and *publicum*. Of these it may be said that *Ponticum* has generally the support of Keller's first class of MSS. It is the reading of A (Parisinus) and B (Bernensis), perhaps the two most valuable extant manuscripts of Horace. *Ponticum* is accordingly read by Ritter. It being absolute nonsense we need not go farther for its refutation. It is as if a poet of our day remarked to a friend living at, say, Folkestone, 'though you occupy the whole English Channel and the Gulf of Mexico with your masonry!'

Publicum has also high support: it is the reading of the Blandinius Vetustissimus, and other respectable MSS. Accordingly *publicum* has been read by Lachmann: but as the Tuscan sea is as much public property as any other sea, and cannot be contrasted with any *publicum mare*, Lachmann changed *Tyrrhenum* to *terrenum*, a most unfortunate change. For not only is *terrenum omne* for *omnem terram* a most suspicious expression, not only is the hyperbole needlessly exaggerated by the addition of land to sea, but the one word that is essential is altered. Compare ii. 18. 17—22: 'Tu secunda marmora Locas sub ipsum funus et sepulcri Immemor struis domos Marisque Baëis obstrepentis urges Summovere litora Parum locuples continente ripa.'

The sea that roared against the shore of Baia was the Tuscan sea, the *mare Tyrrhenum*, and in that sea *only* was it the fashionable mania to build villas. *Tyrrhenum* must not be changed, nor should any other

sea—*Ponticum*, *Apulicum* or *Punicum*—be joined with it. In fact none of the MS. readings is satisfactory, and when MSS. testify to several diverging readings, all objectionable, then it is fair to suppose that they have all sprung from a common source which has been lost. Now here, as there is no sea which can with propriety be coupled with the Tuscan sea, we must look out for something that can with propriety be coupled to *caementis*. And for building houses in water it strikes me that nothing is more necessary than *sublicae* 'piles.' These piles would, in fact, be necessary to construct coffer dams before the stone could be let down into its place: they would be necessary too for constructing bridges to connect the edifice with the main land, if the house were wholly built in the sea. And I suppose Horace wrote

—caementis licet occupes
Tyrrenum omne tuis et mare *sublicis*.

I conjecture further that over *sublicis* was
pontium

written a gloss *pontium* thus, *sublicis*: and that the two best supported readings *Ponticum* and *publicum* were engendered, the former from the gloss *pontium*, the latter from the word *sublicis*: both copyists seeking for an epithet for *mare*, and not seeing that the meaning was simply 'though you occupy the whole Tuscan sea with your masonry and your piles.' *Apulicum*, the reading of the least reputable MSS. is, I suppose, a deliberate correction of *publicum*.

CARM. iv. 13. 17—22.

Quo fugit Venus heu, quove color? decens
Quo motus? quid habes illius, illius,
Quae spirabat amores,
Quae me surpuerat mihi,
Felix post Cinaram notaque et artium
Gratarum facies?

The construction of the last clause is, I believe, (leaving out *et*) '*notaque artium gratarum*,' 'famed for many pleasing arts,' as *Carm.* i. 20. 5, '*notus in fratres animi paterni*' and *Prop.* 4. 7. 74, '*historiae pectora nota suae*.' What then is to be done with *et*? The difficulty will seem to many to have been solved by Mr. Housman, who (*Journal of Philology*, No. 34, p. 317) proposes *nota quot artium*, an emendation which I had myself arrived at. Thinking over the matter however, I believe the corruption lies deeper. For I cannot understand how 'arts' can be attributed to a *face* as a merit. Pro-

pertius, when he speaks of *multis decus artibus* belonging to Cynthia, is not referring to her face: he is referring to her varied accomplishments and winning ways: her poetry, her singing, her reading, and so forth. But what arts of a laudable sort can belong to a *face*? Smiling perhaps. But smiling is not an *art*. If it be, it is only one art. What are the others? Cruquius's commentator answers thus, '*gratarum artium facies illa dicitur quae oculis, nutu superciliorum, cervicis volubilitate, totius denique corporis motu placet*.' These save one are graces not arts, and do not, save two, belong to the face. I propose to read: *notaque dotium gratarum facies*. Forcellini says '*permutantur in codd. dos et ars*.' Ovid uses *dos formae*, *dotes formae*, *dos corporis*: he has *dos oris Met.* 5. 562, but in a different sense, of the 'gift' of singing.

CARM. SAECULARE, 25—28.

Vosque veraces cecinisse, Parcae,
Quod semel dictum est stabilisque rerum
Terminus servet, bona iam peractis
Iungite fata.

I find it impossible to get any satisfactory construction out of these words. Bentley was equally perplexed, and wrote a long note on the passage conjecturing *quod simul dictum est stabilis per aevum Terminus servet*, going much too far from the MSS. Peerlkamp and Ritter take *quod* not as following *cecinnisse* in sense, but as following '*bona—iungite fata*,' followed by *servet* as an optative, expressing a wish: 'a thing which has been promised once for all, and which may the landmark of things secure.' This construction is possible but awkward. To dislocate *quod* from *cecinnisse* is violent: to pray that the immovable decree of Fate may not be changed is superfluous.

I take *quod* in its natural sense as a relative referring to the chant of the Fates. But something is wanting in v. 26, *que* coupled *stabilis rerum terminus* to something. That something must have stood where *est* stands now. The only word that will fit in there is the Latin word for brass: 'Ye Parcae, true in uttering that which, once uttered, brass and the eternal marking-stone of time shall guard.'

Quod, semel dictum, *aes* stabilisque rerum
Terminus servet.

It is scarcely too much to say that *aes* would at some time, in some MSS., infallibly be altered to *est* following *dictum* and pre-

ceding *st.* That it was altered before the time of Servius, is not wonderful. That Horace is fond of the mention of brass as an image of perpetuity, it is scarcely necessary to say: cf. iii. 30. 1, *monumentum aere perennius* and the *aena manus* of Fate herself, i. 35. 19. The subjunctive is the same as in i. 32. 3.

The following conjectures may be worth recording though scarcely worth contending for:—i. 25. 17, *lenta quod pubes.*

i. 32. 15, *mala cuique solve.*

ii. 13. 14, *Bospori—poenas.*

iii. 6. 29, *coram non bene conscio.*

Epod. xvii. 55, *albo tundit—salo.*

A. PALMER.

THE QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

I SHOULD like to thank Mr. Abbott for his contribution to the consideration of the question about the quotations from the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel, and also to point out exactly the position in which his criticism appears to me to leave the matter.

The object of my note in the *Classical Review* for December was to give expression to a doubt which I had long entertained as to the validity of the common argument that the writer of the Fourth Gospel must have been a born Jew who translated the Hebrew for himself, because some of his quotations agreed more closely with the Hebrew text than did the LXX. version. To this argument I objected that it assumed that there was no other source from which the writer could have drawn his quotations except from the LXX. or from his own translation of the Hebrew. It seems to me that there are many possibilities, all of which must be disposed of before we are shut up to the conclusion that he was a Jew and made his own translation. It is possible, if not likely, that he may have had some knowledge of Hebrew, even though he was not a Jew, and Mr. Abbott shows us that very little Hebrew would have been necessary to know that *ἐξεκέντησαν* was the correct translation in Zech. xii. 10; he may have learned the translation from some Hebrew scholar without knowing Hebrew himself; it may have been current as the correct rendering in the school to which he belonged, or in the circle in which he moved; it may have been a marginal reading in a MS.; or there may have been a different translation, or another recension of the LXX. which contained it. With our present knowledge of the time it would be difficult to disprove any of these possibilities, impossible to disprove them all.

This general objection I supported by another argument—namely, that there was some positive reason to believe from the very passage quoted as decisive by Bishop

Lightfoot that there was an earlier version from which the word *ἐξεκέντησαν* might have been taken. It is to this second point only that Mr. Abbott's criticism applies. My three reasons for thinking that there was such an earlier version were: (a) that the reading of the Gospel was also found in the Apocalypse, Justin Martyr, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, and in some MSS. of the LXX.; (b) that Dr. Hatch gave some additional reasons for believing in such an earlier version; and (c) that Dr. Salmon on the same kind of evidence had come independently to the conclusion that there had been an earlier version of 'Daniel' of which no historical record had been preserved.

(a) Against my first reason Mr. Abbott urges that of course Symmachus and Theodotion followed Aquila, and that the readings in some of the MSS. of the LXX. came from the same source. I at once admit that this is not only possible but probable. I regret that my knowledge of the subject is not sufficient to allow me to say more. But I think that Mr. Abbott goes too far when he draws the conclusion that 'as far as this passage (Zech. xii. 10) is concerned there is no indication of the existence of another recension of the LXX. earlier than Aquila.' Of course it is true that Aquila and those who followed him do not prove the existence of anything before Aquila. But my point was that the correspondence between the readings in Aquila and those who came after him with the readings in the Gospel, the Apocalypse, and Justin Martyr, suggests that there may have been some earlier common source from which all got the word *ἐξεκέντησαν*. As Mr. Abbott reduces Aquila and those who came after him to Aquila alone, so questions may also be raised as to the relation between the readings in the Apocalypse, the Gospel, and Justin Martyr. But however those questions be decided, there still remains the coincidence between the Christian Gospel and the Jewish translation to be accounted

for. When Mr. Abbott accounts for the appearance of *ἐξεκέρτησαν* in the Gospel by saying that it was the obvious translation of the Hebrew, he supplies an argument to the other side; for it may be said, If this was so, is it likely that Greek students of the Holy Scriptures at the time when the Gospel was written would have had no means of knowing it unless they were Hebrew scholars and could re-translate the Hebrew for themselves? Is it not much more reasonable to suppose that many of the corrections which were shortly afterwards embodied in Aquila's translation were common property beforehand, just as in the case of the recent Revision of the English Bible many of the alterations introduced by the Revisers were well known beforehand to students of theological literature, and were even contained in preparatory translations?

(b) When I appealed to Dr. Hatch as giving additional reasons for believing in an earlier version, I had in my mind the whole of his fourth and fifth chapters. Unfortunately I referred only to p. 213, because the very passage in question happened to be mentioned there. But this passage in Zechariah is only one out of many upon which Dr. Hatch founds his general conclusion that the coincidences in the early variations from the text of the LXX. were not accidental, but that they point back to earlier recensions or received readings, of which no other record is known to have reached us. No doubt some of Dr. Hatch's instances taken by themselves are very slight and do not appear to prove much, but the general effect of the whole is more convincing. This general result will not be invalidated even though he may have made some slips in matters of detail.

(c) The independent discovery by Dr. Salmon and Professor Gwynn of an earlier version of 'Daniel,' which Mr. Abbott does

not mention, is a strong confirmation of the worth of Dr. Hatch's method, and is an answer to the objection, which may be made, that if these earlier versions had ever existed, they could not have been so completely forgotten. One passage which Dr. Salmon has written bears on this last point, as well as on what I have said above as to the probability of such early versions having been made: 'Is it intrinsically probable that for centuries every Jew competent to ascertain the fact kept to himself his knowledge of the unfaithfulness of the current version; and that none had the charity to make a better version for the use of his Greek-speaking brethren? On the other hand, is it very improbable that such a version, if made, should now only live for us in its successors, as Tyndale's translation lives for us in the Authorised English version?' (p. 606). Perhaps I may mention here that the idea of some earlier Greek source from which the word *ἐξεκέρτησαν* had come occurred to my mind long before the publication of Dr. Hatch's book. It occurred to me when I first read Dr. Sanday's Essay on the Fourth Gospel (1872), soon after its publication, and was suggested by the references in Parkhurst's Lexicon to the places where the word occurs.

The origin of the quotations from the Old Testament which are made by the early Christian writers is a new subject, the further study of which may yet yield important results. All that I am contending for is that in the present state of our knowledge of the matter it is not safe to argue that a writer must have been a Jew who translated the Hebrew for himself because some of his quotations appear to represent the Hebrew more accurately than the present LXX. text does.

JOHN A. CROSS.

APPARATUS CRITICUS AD CICERONIS LIBROS DE NATURA DEORUM.

Z = ABCFMV.

23 eandem corr. ex eundem C || 21 est tantus, est et us m. 2 part. in ras. (*stantur? I) B || obscuritatis M¹ || 25 nominata luna sit (luna del. 2) B || 26 nostras C || imonam vel -aem B¹ || 28 nominatur C¹ numeretur V³⁴ || § 69, 29 diem] idem C¹ || quod ii] B, sed ii 2 sup. ras. unius litt. ; quod C¹ quod hi C²K quodi V¹ || 30 non unquam C || 31 mens aspatio (?) confeci-

unt B¹ || 32 istoria B¹C || 33 eadem dianae effes- II § 68.
sianae (ae in ras. 3, effesiam ut vid. I) A ead.
dianae (-ne B¹V¹) effesia (efes. C) B¹C¹V¹ead.
dianam effesiam B²F diana eadem effesia M¹
dianam eandem effesia M² || templo B²FM ||
deagrauissae A demigrauisse B (sed mi in ras.
scr. et g corr. 2) FM deammigrauisse, mi vel
mmi m. 2, V (templa deflagrauisse spscr. V³⁴)
|| 1 eum] quod B¹ || partu, p m. 2 corr. in ABV

II § 69. (rartu ? A^1B^1) || olimpiadis B^1 olimpiades C (olimpiadis AB^2FMV) || 2 afuisse $A^1BC^1F^1V^1$ abfuisse C^2 afuisset $A^2M^2V^2$ abfuisse A^3V^4 affuisset M^1 || qua B^1 || 3 ex eo A^1 || § 70, 4 uidensne C^1 || 5 ficticios V^4 || 6 falsas genuit M || errorisque A^1V errorisque B^1 || turbulentos, post. u corr. 3, A turbulentos M || 7 nobis, i spscr., A || 8 et ornatus M || nostri F || 9 pro-ducta M || 10 accipimus Z || 11 curuerunt B^1 caluerunt C || 12 duos A^3V^4 deo C || alii || ali V^1 || 13 etiam cum, om. ut, C || titima*nis, ma 2, A titimannis V^1 tianis B^1 || ut cum (post. l.) et cum C ut cum del. et spscr. id est V^3 || 14 credentur A^1 || 15 plena sunt] plenas B^1 || futilitatis] $A^2B^2C^2V^2$ futil. A^1 futil. B^2FV^2K inutilit. C^1 utilitatis M || § 71, 15 iis AC (de V nihil notari) || 16 pretis B^1 (spract. A) || per-ters A^1 perterres M^1 || 17 pro alia C || poterant AB^2F || 18 sunt Z || pr. eos] eos, o corr. 2, A (eius ? A^1) || hoc eos] quos deos Z , sed hos deos corr. V^2 || 19 est optumus] AB^2CFMV om. B^1 || 21 incorrupta mente C || 22 maiorem C^1 || religionem B^1 || § 72, 23 immol. ut] im-molabantur (i) V^1 (immol. ut vid. A^1) || 24 super-stitiosis B^1F^1 (-ciosi A) || 26 diligenter retra-creant om. A^1 || sundicti A^1 || relegiosa B^1 relegiosi B^2M (sed antea fuit religiosi B^2M) || 1 ex relegendo] ex legendo A ex relegando C || elegantes (elig. V^1 ut eligentes V^2) ex elegendo (elig. AMV legendo C) ZK || tam-quam (quam A^1 tanqu. C) legendo delegendis $ABCFMK$ om. V^1 (cf. ad v. 2) tanquam a deligendo deligentes V^2 || 2 ex intellegendo om. V^1 (cf. ad v. 1) suppl. 2; ut ex intell. K || 3 eademque in AB^2FMK eadem quem in C^1 || et religioso om. V^1 suppl. V^3 || 4 uitu A uitii, sed extr. i in ras. 2, B || nomen, men in ras. 2, B || laudandis C^1 || mihi] in hoc (hoc per comp.) C^1 || uidetur V^3 || satis * et C || § 73, 6 est om. A^1 || 7 magne C || uestris] uobis M^1 || 8 uellei minus, i minus in ras. 2, B || 10 amatis, pr. a spscr. 1, A amitis B^1 || incognito $A^1B^1V^1$ || 11 dictu A^1 dictus B^1 || factidicam AV^1 || pro-noean $ACFMV$ pronoean*, an 2, B || ast*oicis (r) A as astoicis C^1 || induci A || 12 ea errore C || existimes B^1 existimas B^2F existimabas C || ab his BFM || 14 id] uel C || praecise* B || § 74, 14 athen., t in ras. 2, B || 15 regi] rei M^1 || desit in ras. C^2 || ariopagi—dicimus om. B^1 || ariopagi] A^3 arpagi A^1B^2CFMV || cum, c in ras. 2, A || providentiam BFM^1 || 16 mun-dundum V^1 || arbitrio FM^2 || de eorum V^1 || 17 existumato $ABFV$ || 18 solem C^2 || in iri-landis (irrid. V) Z (in err. typ. om.) || con-summere BF || 19 me ercule AC me hercule B^2FV me hercules M mercuriae B^1 || docet F^1 || 20 haec (nec 2) uero in te C || uno...limato Z || 22 peperit] aperit B^1 || 23 artes BF^1 || lit-teris spscr. 1 || C (liter. M) || acumine* ullo AV (o eras. ?) acumine ullo, mine in ras. et

ullo spscr. 2, B || actoritate AV actuita (N) B^1 || § 75, 25 inocio constitas B^1 || et in omni M^1 || 26 tres A^3C || 27 ducitur corr. 1 ex dicitur B || 28 concessa B^1 || 29 docent B^1 || 1 pul-cherume A pulchrume C^1V^1 pulcherrime B^2C^2FMK pulcherrimae ē B^1 || quo] quod $A^1B^1M^1V^1$ || 2 eam esse generatam ZK || dici-tur $ACMV$ || § 76, 4 deos esse M || 5 et in ras. B^2 || 6 concedant, ant in ras. 2, B concedunt M || iis in ras. B^2 is AV^1 his CM || 9 est esse melius V^2 || *ui praeditum (q ? eras. ; tum in ras. corr. 2) B || deos Z || 10 inanimata V^3 || necessitas A || pulcherrima, er in ras. 2, B || § 77, 12 eam C^1 (aea B^1) || ei] ea B^1 || 13 qui caelum C || 14 mundundum V^1 || inulli B^1 || natura obaediens C || 15 deos B^1 || omne C^1 || 16 si concedimus, post. c in ras. 2, B || provi-dentes, es in ras. 2, B || 17 maxumarum, pr. m in ras. ampl. 3, A maxumarum CM || maximae CM (maxume B^1V^1) || 18 ea modo C heae modo M (ea emodo V^1) || qua] qui AF || 19 generant B^1M^1 || alienaturae A^1 || 21 maie-statem, post. m eras., C || § 78, 23 modo sint Z || profecto sunt corr. ex prof. sint F || ani-mantes esse C || solum animantes Z || 24 ra-tiones B^1C^1 || competes $A^1B^1V^1$ || 25 coniunctos, post. n spscr., A || *unum B (comp. per eras. ?) || rem publicam] per p. (per comp.) A rem p. B (sed rem in ras. 2) et F *r. p. V || 26 re-gentes B^2FM || § 79, 26 sequitur, itur in ras. 2, B || is A his MVK || quae] quam B^1 qua F^1 (que AK) || 27 utrobique A^1 || eademque lex, mque lex in ras. novem litt. 2, B || 28 prauique, e in ras. ampl. 2, B prauique M^1 || 29 causa C^1 || 30 malorum $A^1C(?)V^1$ || institutos B^1 in-structis M^1 || publicae AB^2CFV || 31 paenes BF || deos esse, s esse in ras. 2, B || 33 ab his superis B (sed post. s in ras. 2) FM || superis defluere, s de in ras. 1 vel. 2, V || 36 uti in] ut in B^1V^1 et ut vid. A^1 (corr. A^3) || maximus B^1 maximis B^2CF || obtumis A obtimis BF o-ptimis C || § 80, 36 autem] V^2 add. esse, postea correct. in est || maius] magis B^1 || 1 eum om. B^1 || 2 docueri*mus, m corr. 2, A || 5 in om. A || 6 regi om. B^1 || § 81, 9 pulcherrime*, post. e in ras. 2, B pulcherrima F^1 pulcherime M^1 (pulcherrimae V^1) || 10 falius A^1 || 12 neces-sarios, o corr. 2, A || 13 procedentem B^1 || declarentemque BF || cuiusque rei, que rei in ras. 2, B || 15 emitando A^1V^1 || 16 inci* || derit, alt. i ex e corr., B incuderit C^1 incident F || comprehendentemque, alt. n spscr. 2, A com-prehendentemque (-quae B^1) BF comprae-h. C comprehend. V^1 comprehend. V^2 || 17 nantum-que B^1 nactumque B^2F MV^2 || iam quaali in ras. A^3 quali C || 18 quicque $A^1(?)B^2FMV^1$ quaeque A^3 quicque B^1 || 19 possent $A^1BCF^1V^1$ || 20 et ex sese—appellent om. F (in B versus dividuntur : pos | sent et ex sese...appel | lent ut...) || *simi-lia (e ?) C || § 82, 21 epicurus corr. 2 ex aepi

culus (?) *B* || 22 et inane quaeque et inane iis *A* ||
his *BM* (*de F nihil not.*) || 23 administrare quae
*B*¹ || *ut (aut ?) *B* || claebam *A*¹ *V*¹ aclebam *B*¹
clebam *V*² glebam *B*² *CFMV*³ *K* || 24 ac frac-
mentum *B*¹ || coerendi *B*¹ (coherendi *ACFV*¹ *K*)
|| 25 nulla natura temeritas, *sed* natura *del.*,
C || § 83, 27 a *om.* *C* || 28 continetur arte (-tae
*V*¹) naturae *Z* cont. arte natura *K* || **quippe
B || 29 pariat, at *corr.* 2, *A* || et sese *B*¹ || 30 et
in ras. *B*² || uicissim a] uicesima *B*¹ uicissim a
*B*² *F*¹ || a *in ras.* *C*² || superis, p *corr.* et *er in*
ras. 2, *B* || eiusdem qui *A* (-quae *M*¹) || 31 et aer]
ettaer *A*¹ ettaher *A*² aether *M* aer, *om.* et, *in*
ras. *V*³⁻⁴ || ut aether *B*¹ (etthaer *A*) || supra *V*¹
|| 31 Ita *om.* *C* || 33 earis (*e incert.*) *B*¹ || 34 i-
psaeque ipsae (*alt.* ipsae *eras.*) *A* (ipse quae
*BF*¹) || uidet nobiscum audit nobiscum *om.* *V*¹
in mg. totam sent. ipseque—sonat *adscr.* *V*⁴
|| 35 eorum *om.* *V*¹ horum *V*³⁻⁴ || mouebitur *B*¹
|| 36 himus *A*¹ *V*¹ minus *B*¹ || qua mouemur
*AB*¹ *CV*¹ || § 84, 37 infimus, mus *corr.* 2, *C* ||
et *om.* *B*¹ || 1 unamque, un *corr.* *ex nn.* *A* || 2
uicissitud. *B* || contineata *B*¹ || 3 *oritur *A* || ex
aere aether] ex aetherexre (?) *B*¹ || uicissim
retrorsum *C*¹ || 4 uicissime *B*¹ || athere *A*¹ || 5
is *AV* his *MK* hiis *BF*¹ || sursum deorsum
ultra citra *M*² || comeantibus *C* || 6 coniuncto
*C*¹ || § 85, 6 aut] autem *B*¹ (?) *M*¹ || necessesit *A*
et *ut vid.* *C*¹ || 7 uidimus *V*¹ || aut, u *spscr.* 1, *A*
A || diuturna *AB*² *FM* || 8 ad] aut *C* || longin-
quum *B*¹ || 11 arboris, s *in ras.* *ampl.* 2, *B* || 13
ipsa *vel* ipsam *C*¹ || regatur aut] regatura et
*V*¹ || 14 regio *B*¹ || § 86, 15 semina, a *corr.* 2 *ex*
um ? *C* || potest] post *C*¹ || non *om.* *B*¹ ||
16 autem, u *spscr.*, *A* || 18 (que *ACV*¹) || ec-
ferant] *V*¹ et ferant *AC* haec ferant *B*¹ haec
ferat *B*² *FM* eo ferant *V*² || aliquid (*corr.* *ex*
-quit *A*) largitate fundit *sqg.* (§ 156, 8) *Z*; *cf.*
ad § 15, 20. *Abhinc usque ad* § 92, 24 deficit
etiam V.

Z = *ABCFM*.

19 ex his efferantur *Z* || 22 omnia qui *F*² (-quae
*F*¹) || sicut membra *om.* *B*¹ || 23 administrari
natura *M* || 25 ex his *Z* || § 87, 26 aliquid *A*¹ ||
27 facit *AB*¹ *CM* || 28 non *om.* *AB*¹ *C* || quid si *A*
|| 29 constituae *C* (constituae *A*¹) || ad usum—
esse neque *om.* *A*¹ || 30 uidemus *om.* *FK* || for-
tuita necne *C*² || 31 coquo herere *C*¹ (quo coher.
*A*¹ *B*¹ *M*¹) || 32 nature *A*¹ *corr.* 3 || quae*arte (p?)
B (que arte *A*¹) || 33 nec] ne *A*¹ || ne] nec
*B*² *FMK* || 34 expers, ers *in ras.* 2, *B* || 35 artem]
partem *M*¹ || procul cursum] procursum *C* ||
cursum, cur *in ras.* 3, *A* sursum *B*¹ || 1 so-
larium] *add.* uel horologium *A*³ || uel de-
scriptum aut ex *Z* || intelligi *C*¹ (intelligere
*AC*²) || 3 expertes *C* || putarem *ABF*¹ || § 88, 3
quid (?) si *A*¹ || 4 si in] sim *C*¹ *F*, *sed in*
hoc corr. 1 || cythiam *B*¹ schithiam *M* || brit-
tanniam *A*¹ brittanniam *BF* britanniam *C* || 5
efficit *B*¹ || possidonius *A*² *BF* possed. *M*¹ || 6

et luna, *om.* in, *B*¹ *M* || errantibus *bis scr.* *B*¹ || II § 82.
7 caelo] sole *B*¹ || 8 quin] quid *C*¹ || hii *M* || 9
quo oriuntur, *om.* et, *alt.* o *in ras.*, *C* || 11 in
imitandis] in *om.* *A*¹ in inimicandis *M*¹ ||
sphaerae *M*¹ (sphaerae *ABCF*) || natura *M*¹ ||
§ 89, 13 atque *Z* || actium *Z* || 14 uidisset ante
M || 15 et monte *A*¹ || conspexit, e *ex a corr.*
ut uid., *B* || 16 tanto *C* || 17 fremebunda *B*² *FM*
|| so*nitum (m ?) *A* || strepitu *Z* || 18 undas euol-
uit *ACM* || nertices*ui *B* || 19 reflat] profluit
Z || 20 nimb*um *B* || uoluiet, er 2 *in ras.* *trium*
lit., *B* uoluiet *C*¹ || 21 mentis, *sed corr.* 1, *A*, *B*
|| 24 terrestres *A*¹ terrestres *A*² *BCFM* || pon-
tus*strages, *extr.* s 2, *B* || 25 auforte *BF* || tri-
con *B*¹ || fuscineuertens *B*¹ supra ne *scr.* a *B*²
fuscinauertens *FM* || 26 subter] terra dices
*B*¹ || undantes ueniant freto *Z* || 27 saxeam ad]
saxeam at *AC* saxae amat *B*¹ saxeum ad *M*¹ ||
29 suis isauditoque *B*¹ || 30 sicut inciti atque
AB (*sed sicut in ras.* *B*²) *C*¹ *F*² *M* sicut inciatque
*F*¹ || (31 delfini *Z*) || 34 consimile *Z* || § 90, 35
uacuum, *alt.* u *spscr.*, *C* || 2 si] nisi *F* || 3 post-
ea****cum *B* || uidissent, n *spscr.*, *C* || 4 omnia
queratis *ABF*² omnia quaeratis *C*¹ *F*¹ *M*¹ || 6
architectus (?) *C*¹ || 7 numeris *A*¹ || § 91, 10 hanc
*C*¹ || animabili *ABCM* amabili *F* || est est aer
*C*¹ || quidem illud *F* || 11 a nostritum *A*¹ || 12
hun *A*¹ || 13 mutuemur* *B* metuemur *C*¹ || haec
*C*¹ || queque *B*¹ || 14 et sicut *C*² || pacubius *B*¹
|| 15 gai *A*¹ grai *A*² *BCFM* || 17 g quasi *C*¹ ||
grauus *B*¹ grauis *C*¹ graus *C*² || 19 grauigena
*B*¹ *C*¹ || isto *Z* || oratio] ornati *B*¹ || § 92, 20 innu-
merabilis *M*¹ || 21 conlustras *A*¹ || 22 atque, t
corr. 2, *A* || 23 tanti, i *corr.* *ex e, A*, nti *corr.* 2,
B || ignis *C*¹ || 24 | terris rebusque incipit *V*
(*fol. I*).

Z = *ABCFMV*.

25 loca *CF* || confraglare *B*¹ || terra *A*¹ || § 93,
27 ergo *V*² || 30 quur *A*¹ || 31 innumerabiles
*AB*² *CFMV* || uigingi *B*¹ || 32 coniciantur *V*³⁻⁴
|| ex his *ACMV* || terra *M* || 33 annales *F* ||
enni *AB*¹ *CV*¹ || possunt *A*¹ possit *F* || § 94, 36
poeteta *BM* poeteta *F* poeta *C* poetiteta
A poetoteta *V* || 37 mundum esse, *extr.* m et
esse *in ras.* 2, *B* || innuber. *B*¹ || potius, ius
in ras. 3, *A* || 39 non cursus *V*¹ || 39-40 quur
quater *A* || 40 multa *BF* || 1 effatiant *AB*² *FV*
effitiant *B*¹ || mihi] nichil *C*¹ (michi *C*² *V*²) || 2
proximus, i *in ras.* *ampl.* 2, *B* || § 95, 3 pre-
dare *F*¹ (precl. *BF*²) || aristoteles *B*² *C* aristo-
tetiles *F* || 4 terram *C* || sempe *B*¹ || 5 his *Z* ||
abundant hi *AV* habundantii, t et post. i
corr. 2, *B* et, *corr.* 1 *ex* habundantia, *F* habun-
dat (-ant ?) hi *C* habundant hi *M* || 7 nomen
*B*¹ || 9 sedilibus *C* || 10 terra *C* || nubium—co-
gnouissent *om.* *C* || 11 cum] tum *V*² || 12 quod
his *C*¹ quod dis *V*¹ || 13 opacasset *CM* || 14 tum]
cum *ABFMV*¹ || totum caelum *M* || 15 tum
crescentis *spscr.* *C*¹, *sed rursus deleta sunt* ||
17 opera tanta *M* || § 96, 19 eruptionem (?) *A*¹ ||

II § 96. *ethnaeorum A aeterna eorum B¹ aethnaeorum B²V aethneorum CF aethneorum M* || 23 uideretur *A* || 23 luce *C¹* || 24 quotid. *A²* || aduiescant *A¹* (assuescunt *CV*) || 25 perinde *V²* || § 97, 28 motus caeli *M* || 29 nullam *A* || inesse *M* || eaque que *V²* || 30 generantur *B¹* || 31 shaeram *B¹* (spher. *FMV*) || 32 sint opera *F* || 33 impetu *B¹* || admirabi *B¹* || celeritate—uertique *in ras. ampl. 2 vel 1 A* (caeler. *B¹CF¹M*) || 1 uideamus *Z* || cum] tum *V²* || 2 rerum, u corr. 2, *B* || eanon, pr. u corr. ex r 21, *B* || 3 fiant, a corr. 2, *V* || rationem, m del. 1, *B* || § 98, 4 a subtilitate *C¹* (supt. *V¹*) || quod admodo *C* || 5 prudentia *B¹FK* || 6 Ac *in ras. A³* || cernatur] natu *B¹* || 7 globora *A* || ipsa om. *B¹* || sese, alt. se *spscr. 1, B* || 8 a floribus *A¹* || herbis *F* || frugibus om. *B¹* || 9 ueritate *C¹* (uariet. *A*) || destinguitur *C* || adde hunc *C¹V¹* corr. *C²V²* adhuc *V³* || fontum *ABFMV¹K* || 10 uidissimos *A¹* || 11 asperitas *A¹* || 12 montium altitudines om. *M¹* || imensitatesque *B¹* (imensitatesque *B²CFV*) || camparum *C¹* || § 99, 14 cicuram *F¹* || uolucrum *ABFMV* || 17 stirpium *C¹* || 18 quorumque corr. ut vid. ex eorumque *AV* || 19 et urb.] eturribus *A³* || oculis corr. ex -us *A* corr. ex uc. *B* || possimus *ACFMV¹K* et, corr. 1 ex possumus, *B* || 20 contuens *V²* || de *spscr. 1 ? V* || ratio *B¹* || § 100, 20 At uero] a uero *B¹* || 21 uarietas* *B* || 22 littorum *M* || quod *B¹V¹* quotquot *FK* || 23 mersarum *A¹* submersorum *M* || fluctantium *C* || 24 saxasanatiuis *AB¹V¹* saxosanatiuis *B²FK* || 25 eludit *ZK*, sed elidit *C²* || natura *MK* || § 101, 26 exin, in *spscr. 1, V* exim *B¹FK* || aer om. *A¹CV¹* add. *A³V⁴* || hisque *M* || 27 concremus *A¹* || homoremque *V¹* (hum. *MV²K*) || 28 effluens *AB¹* || 29 Idem] idemque *M¹* || uarietas *C¹* || 30 alitum] altum *B¹* || spiritus *ZK*, sed post. s in *Veras.* || 31 ad domic. *C* || 32 cohercens *ACM²V¹* coherens *M¹* || quidem *A¹B¹* || et aether *B¹* (eth. *C*) || hora *C¹V* || § 102, 34 ex *A¹* || 35 terram *B¹* || hisque *M* (isquae *A¹*) || 2 ad extr. *C* || 3 contrhit terram *A¹* contrahitur terra *C* || § 103, 5 ostendum *A¹V¹* || iisdem *B²FV²* || 6 cum sole tum degrediens om. *V¹* add. *V²*; *C¹* iisdem uerbis primum omis- sis scr. et eam lucem quam a sole | tum degrediens et eam lucem qu. a s. acc. *sqg.*, corr. *C²* (solae utroque loco *A*) || digrediens *B²FMV³K* || 8 habeat, a del. 1 ? , *B* || 9 terre* *C* || 10 deficit *AV¹* || iisdemque *B²F* hisdemque *M* || 11 eae] ea *B¹* et *FK* || stelle* *C* || terrae *V¹* || 12 motus] modus *A¹* || 13 sae *B¹* (sepe *AM*) || § 104, 13 potest] post *C* || 14 inerrentium *B¹* || maximultitudo *A¹* || 15 distinc] tio, tinc add. et io corr. 2, *A* || notarum corr. 1 ? ex -orum *B*

|| figurarum om. *C¹* || 17 arti (i) eis *A¹* arates *B¹* arati eis *A²B²CFMV* || ad te *B¹* || 18 ex his *B¹FM* ex is *V¹* || 20 labentur *M* || caleri *B¹* caeleri *FM* || § 105, 22 nullus *A¹* || 23 uideri *BF* || 24 duplici *C* || nertex *B¹* || 26 arctoae *Z*, sed arctoae *V²* || duae *in ras. B²* || 27 ex iis *ACFV* || graio|scunosura *B¹* || 28 altera ex alter corr. 1 ? *B* || haelice *BF* helicae *V* || 30 soliti, t corr. ex c1, *V* || § 106, 33 Hac] ac *B¹* || (foenices *AMV* fen. *BF* faen. *C*) || 34 refulgit *A¹* || 35 a nocte] nocte *F²M* || 36 in hac *in ras. B²* || 39 rapides *BF* || fulmen *V¹* || 1 subter *ACMV* || supraque *Z* || reuoluens sese conficiensque om. *A¹* || § 107, 3 totus *C¹* || sit] est *Z* || suspicienda *V²* || 4 ardor, a corr. 2, *C* || 5 uno *C* || 7 etrucibusque, et *in ras. 3, A* || fragrant (i) *B¹* || 9 opstipum] ast ipsum *B²FM* || atereti *Z*, sed *in B* corr. 1 ex ateriti || 10 figure *V¹* || § 108, 11 relicum *B¹* || 12 paululum *M* || subitoque recondit *Z* || 13 partim (parte *M*) admiscetur in una *Z* || 14 autem *in ras. B²* || 15 defessa *C* || uelut *in ras. B²* || (merentis *Z*) || 18 engonasiām *ACMV* engnosiam *BF* || uogitant *B¹* uocant *C¹* || 19 fulgora coronata *C* fulgocorona *F¹* || 20 autem om. *M* || anguinentis *A²B²FM* || § 109, 21 ofuchum *C* (ofuch. *ABFMV*) || grai *M* || 23 atque eius] eius et *B²FM* || toto *A²* || 24 uirum om. *A¹* || saerpens (t i) *B* serpens, praeter pr. s *in ras. 2, V* || 26 uirguet *B¹* (urget *ACMV*) || nepe *A¹V¹* corr. *A³V³* nepar, r radendo *in i* corr., *B* nepii *C* || 27 septemtriones *CM* || 28 arctofylax *AC* arctofil. *BFV* artofil. *M* || uulgo, uu *in ras. 2, B* || quidigitur *B¹* || bootēs, alt. o *spscr.*, *C* || 29 temone *ABC¹FMV* || adiunctam, tam *spscr. 2, A* adiunctam *B¹* || aretum cum praeced. t *in ras. B²* aratum *F¹* || § 110, 30 Dein quae] deinde *FM* || 31 sub terrae cordia *A¹V¹* (precordia *A³*) || 33 cui] cuius *AB¹CV* || 34 uigo** *C* || 1 descriptionibus *BMV⁴* || 3 inuisses *ACV¹* || aretis *B¹* aretis *C¹* arotis *C²* || 4 subiectos *B¹* || media est *Z* || 6 auriga, *ras. suppr. u* (= autem i), *B* aurigam *C¹* || 7 subleua *Z*, sed *in Bras. supra 1* || obductur *C¹* obducta *C²* || feretur] tenetur *V³* || 8 elice *A¹BF* helice *A³CMV* || trulenta *F* || 9 laeum *A¹B¹V¹* laeuum *C* || clarae (i) *A* claro *CV* || 11 illustri *C* (ill. *V*) || 13 cui sub *C* || 14 conexus *Z*, sed connexus corr. *V²* || § 111, 15 consp. est stellis frequ. *M* || 16 fuerunt *C* || 17 adpluendo *B¹* || hyin *ABFMV* hiene *C* || enim bis scr. *A¹* || plure *C* || nosti *A¹* || imperita *B¹* (imperiti *F²*) || succulas *V* || sucibus *C* suibus *M* || 18 septemtr. *CM* || 19 a tergo] terga *AB²CFMV* terca *B¹* || 20 ipsum *Z* || cynosura *ACV* cynosyre *C* cynosyrae *F* || 21 huic *M¹* || | tecedid denuo incipit *P*.

P. SCHWENKE.

(Continuabitur.)

JEBB'S PHILOCTETES.

It is not necessary to dwell on the main characteristics to be looked for in Professor Jebb's work. Every scholar knows by this time what to expect in a new volume: and in this, the fourth volume of the series, he will not be disappointed. We find the same mastery of all information needful for understanding or useful for illustration; the same literary skill in the discussions and translations, the same precision and lucidity in the notes; above all the same combination of fine and just literary judgment, ingenuity and subtlety of emendation, and delicate insight into Greek linguistic usage, which we know not where to find outside this great commentary.

The most interesting feature of the preface is the full account the editor gives, with many valuable suggestions, of the comparison left to us by Dio Chrysostom of the three great dramatists' work on this theme. Dio's account is tantalisingly imperfect: if he had only realised that his *causerie* would survive, and two out of the three plays be lost, how differently would he have written! But imperfect though it be, such a comparison carries, in its degree, the same sort of interest and instruction that we derive from comparing the three extant plays on the story of Orestes, the *Electras* of Euripides and Sophocles, and the *Choephori* of Aeschylus.

In dealing with the text Professor Jebb's various qualifications have perhaps their fullest scope. The traditional readings are never either abandoned or maintained without full trial; and we think the editor's power is shown quite as much where he maintains the MS. text or selects a suggestion of a previous emender, as where he makes a correction of his own. There is always a full discussion of the grounds, rarely without some new and subtle points. Still it is to the editor's own emendations that attention will naturally be first directed. The most convincing of these, we think, occurs on line 728, where the MSS. read (speaking of Herakles)

.. ἦν ὁ χάλκασις ἀνὴρ θεοῖς
πλάθει πᾶσιν (πᾶσι L.) θείῳ πυρὶ παμ-
φαῖς. . .

Here πᾶσιν is both metrically wrong (*antistr. ὄρον*) and superfluous in meaning; and Professor Jebb brilliantly conjectures πατρός. We might certainly, as he says,

expect a reference to Zeus, to whom Oeta was sacred: and πατρός, he might have added, being a word often abbreviated is easily corrupted.

Another suggestion, which may be called certain, is (line 1125) ἐγγελά for γελά μου, at once curing the defects of metre and grammar, and supplying an explanation of the corruption.

A much bolder change is his correction of the line 782, which appears in L. as follows:

ἀλλὰ δέδοικ' ὦ παῖ μή μ' ἀτελὲς εὐχή

and is open to the following objections—(1) that it is dochmiac, whereas it ought to be iambic; (2) that there is no verb; (3) that με has nothing to govern it. Professor Jebb offers the following suggestion:

ἀλλ' ὄκνος ὦ παῖ μή ἀτέλεστ' εὐχῇ μ' ἔχει.

which will strike most people perhaps as improbable at first sight: but we can safely say that the editor's defence of his emendation will be found to be a singularly acute and subtle piece of reasoning.

His correction of the incredible φηγᾶ μ' οὐκέτ' ἀπ' αἰλίων πελάτ' (1142) has been long known to readers of the *Journal of Philology*, where he proposed, in 1869, μηκέτ' ἀπ' αἰλίων φηγᾶ πηδάτ'. The last word is extremely ingenious, and it carried the other changes almost by necessary consequence.

In 1092, where the MSS. give:

εἶθ' αἰθέρος ἄνω
πτωκάδες ὀξύτόνον διὰ πνεύματος ἔλωσί μ'

it has long been recognized that εἶθε is corrupt, and that ἔλωσί μ' should be ἔλωσιν. Professor Jebb's πέλειαι δ' ἄνω is ingenious, but his objections to αἰθέρος are not valid against Nauck's brilliant γοναὶ δ' αἰθέρος; for with this reading we have a substantive to agree with πτωκάδες, and we do not retain ἄνω. One may be allowed to prefer Nauck's emendation; it is more imaginative, it does not confine the πτωκάδες to *doves*, and it is really nearer to the MSS.

As a specimen of the manner in which, when the editor does adopt a conjecture of a previous scholar, he sometimes may almost be said to make it his own by a thorough and convincing discussion, we may point to line 188, where the βαρεία δ' ἀθυρόστομος of L. had always been a difficulty, till S. Mekler, in his revision of Dindorf's Sophocles, made

the splendid correction, ὁρεία δ' ἀθυρόστομος, curing the metrical error and the unsatisfactory sense, and giving exactly the right epithet to Echo. Professor Jebb has for the first time brought out the full merits of this correction.

In the matter of spelling, we must brace our minds, we suppose, to admit into our texts the forms proved by contemporary inscriptions. It is much harder to write προσμείξαι (106) and οἰκίρω (169) than to change (for example) one's grammatical theories or one's political views: but we suppose it has to be done. Professor Jebb makes a new advance each time: in this volume, besides the above, we have σφίζω (134), θρήσκω (1443), τείσω (959), and last, but not easiest, ποῖν (120, and appendix). After all it is only what our fathers underwent in Latin on a much larger scale: and even now some fossils object to *Vergilius*.

As regards the interpretation, it is impossible in our limits to do any justice to the editor's work, more especially as a critic has necessarily to dwell more on points of difference than of agreement. It is all the more needful to say, what the present critic at any rate feels strongly, that for one place where he is able to suggest any improvement on Professor Jebb's view, there are scores where the editor has brought out for the first time some new bearing, or *nuance* of meaning, in a word or expression, which is a real addition to the understanding of the text. I may perhaps quote, as an instance chosen almost at random, the excellent note on τάνδ' αἴγλαν (831), which is interpreted to mean the 'dream light' that rests on the sleeper's face, now that the pang has passed. We are reminded of the advantage of having a poet interpreted by an editor with poetic sensibilities, when we find that one commentator takes it to mean 'darkness' by *oxymoron*, and another argues at length for its signifying 'a bandage'!

In passing to the grammatical notes, which in Sophocles are especially needful, as the poet is one of those artists in diction who is always straining the grammar, Professor Jebb shows three qualities, all most valuable: he very seldom misses a passage which requires a note; he always decides the point, carefully striking a balance if it is disputed; and his exposition is usually admirably clear. Good examples may be found of this exposition both where no doubt is possible, as line 443, ὅς οὐκ ἂν εἴλετ' εἰσάπαξ λέγειν ὅπου Μηδείας ἐψη, and where there are various views taken, as in 493, παλαιὸν ἐξ ὅτου δέδοικα μή μοι βεβήκη. In this latter instance the

editor seems finally to dispose of παλαι' ἂν: but I do not see why the Laurentian βεβήκοι should not be retained, since the principal verb, δέδοικα, though primary, contains and includes a past: on the very principle, in fact, admirably expounded and illustrated by Professor Jebb on line 199, πρὶν ὅδ' ἐξήκοι.

On 761 he explains the common (yet grammatically singular) expression βοῦλει λάβωμαι; by treating βοῦλει as parenthetic. It is no doubt true that both are principal verbs; but it would be preferable to avoid the word *parenthetic*, which suggests a check or pause in the sentence that clearly is not there, and to regard it in Riddell's phrase (*Digest of Idioms*, § 204) as a *binary structure*; somewhat like τίς πόθεν ἦλθες, for example, where no one would speak of the second question as parenthetic.

Another grammatical point where one may differ more seriously from the editor arises on line 281, where occurs the unusual construction ὁρῶντα . . . οὐδέν' ἔμπον, οὐχ ὅστις ἀρκέσειεν. The meaning is undoubted, 'seeing no one there, none to aid.' The grammatical analysis is harder and more disputable, and here I do not feel Professor Jebb's note to be satisfactory. The note begins by treating the sentence as an oblique deliberative: but if this be right, as it probably is, it should be pointed out that the construction is so stretched that the *interrogative character* is lost. The fact I believe to be that the deliberative construction is subtly modified, and three stages may be traced as follows:—first stage, οὐκ ἦδεν ὅστις ἀρκέσειεν, 'I did not know who was to aid'—truly interrogative and deliberative: second stage, οὐκ εἶχον ὅστις ἀρκέσειεν, where the *interrogative character* is sliding into the *relative*: third stage, οὐδ' ἐν' εἶχον ὅστις κ.τ.λ. where the *relative character* of ὅστις is established. The last usage is what we have here: it is so like the Latin final *qui* with subjunctive that few readers or commentators stop to notice the difference; but it certainly is not that, else we could say ἐπεμψα ὅστις ἀγγέλλοι, which we cannot do: it is always ἀγγελεῖ. Professor Jebb should have said clearly 'This is an extension of *deliberative construction*, used after negative sentences, which becomes at last *practically equivalent to the final (relative with future)*: and he should have told us the limits within which it is used. He refers to the *final construction* in the end of the note, though without naming it and without distinguishing it from the deliberative: and this would be most misleading to the beginner. I will only add that the illustration he gives from Aristo-

phanes (*Fr.* 96) should be classed rather as *assimilated opt.*; that the three examples at the end are *normal deliberatives*, which it is superfluous to quote; and, last but not least, that the very same construction which is causing us such trouble occurs again in the play (695) with its *relative* character fully developed (ϕ for $\sigma\tau\phi$), again after a negative clause, and yet is quite unnoticed by the editor.

I had hoped to discuss one or two more points of grammar; but space does not permit, and I must be content with a mere handful of references and suggestions. Line 797: is not $\eta\kappa\alpha\iota$ in its common Attic sense 'come back'? 935: $\mu\eta$ cannot be due to the meaning 'if': $\omega\varsigma$ (= 'as if') is not conditional. Surely $\mu\eta$ is due to 'strong assurance' see

1329. 985: the doctrine of 'divided attribute' should be stated. 1006: a slight confusion here about 'generic' $\mu\eta$: it is the *man* who is 'of the kind to think nothing sound: it would still be $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\nu$ if $\gamma\iota\gamma\iota\varsigma$ were away. 303: $\xi\nu\omega\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$: it should be said that Attic *prefers* this fut. pass. in *pure* verbs. 350 $\alpha\iota\pi\eta\sigma\sigma\omicron\upsilon\mu\iota$: why not say simply, '*orat. obliq.*'? But enough. These are mostly minor points: and even if such criticisms were all admitted, where much is no doubt disputable, they would in no wise affect the feelings of gratitude and admiration for Professor Jebb's work on Sophocles, which every succeeding volume only serves to deepen.

A. S.

GWATKIN'S *CTESIPHONTEA* OF AESCHINES.

Aeschines in Ctesiphontea. Edited with Notes and Indices by T. GWATKIN, M.A. and EVELYN S. SHUCKBURGH, M.A. (Macmillan's Classical Series). London, 1889. Pp. lii., 282. 5s.

IN the preparation of this serviceable edition of the *Ctesiphontea* of Aeschines Mr. Gwatkin is responsible for the text and for the notes on §§ 1-160; Mr. Shuckburgh for the notes on §§ 161-260 and for the revision of the earlier notes, for the Introduction, Appendices and Indices, as also for 'a certain number of changes in the text' introduced 'in view of more recent criticism.' The stereotyped plates, made for the edition of this speech published with Drake's excellent *De Corona* of Demosthenes as long ago as 1860, are used for this book, with a few changes; the fact, however, that in these plates in their original form the text of the Zurich edition of 1841 was 'adhered to without any variation' is nowhere made known and the alterations of Mr. Gwatkin and Mr. Shuckburgh at no point interfere with integrity of the lines of the stereotyped plates. These changes are exceedingly few in number. In §§ 1-78, barring corrections of orthography and the like—as $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ etc. for $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ etc. for $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$, $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu\alpha\varsigma$ for $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu\alpha\varsigma$, $\pi\rho\omicron\alpha\gamma\omega\nu$ for $\pi\rho\omicron\alpha\gamma\omega\nu$ (§ 67); but $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (§ 6), $\delta\iota\alpha\pi\eta$ (§ 56—at § 166, however, $\pi\rho\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\iota}\zeta\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$), $\tau\iota$ for $\tau\acute{\iota}$ (§ 37) $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ (§ 12—at § 17, however, we have $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\nu\alpha$) are allowed to stand—and the occasional insertion of brackets (at §§ 41,

57, 61, 74)—there are only the following: § 2 $\xi\zeta\eta\nu$, § 3 $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$, § 8 $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omicron\tau\alpha$, § 16 $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\omicron\phi\iota\sigma\tau\eta\nu$, § 36 $\tau\eta\delta\epsilon$ $\tau\eta$ $\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$, § 39 ' $\gamma\omicron\mu\omicron\theta\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\iota$,' § 41 $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\nu$. The text, then, is that of BS., with corrected orthography and such other emendations, very few in number, as could be introduced into the stereotyped plates without injury to them. It is unfortunate that an ingenious and independent editor should be thus hampered by book-making considerations. In Appendix C. (Notes on the Text) Mr. Shuckburgh endeavours to make amends for these artificial restrictions. But this part of the book is far from satisfactory. It begins with a misleading misprint: the three codices embraced in group A are not Bekker's g k l, but e k l. This appendix consists mainly of indications of Weidner's readings (1872, 1878), and of information as to the readings of groups A (e k l) and B (a g m n), where these are divergent. Almost none of Weidner's suggestions, however, are adopted and they are regarded as 'often violent and unnecessary.' Still Mr. Shuckburgh thinks that Weidner's emendations are of 'considerable value, and deserve to be considered in each case.' At the same time he does not give us anywhere an account of Weidner's main theses, which alone render his (or even Mr. Shuckburgh's) procedure intelligible. Attention should at least have been called to the assumption that all codices not in group A or B are copies of MSS. in or cognate to those of these groups, and are not traceable to independent archetypes.

The promise to record deviations from BS. is not faithfully kept (*e.g.* at §§ 3, 8, 16, 48 out of §§ 1-78, not including all the bracketed passages). There are also numerous critical notes scattered throughout the exegetical commentary. Two original emendations have caught my eye, not introduced however into the text: at § 7, for the *εἰς τήνδε τὴν ἡμέραν* of 'some MSS.' (*ceh kn p*-Schultz, other MSS. omit *εἰς*), *εἶναι* is suggested. But for *εἰς*, *κ.τ.λ.* cf. *Dem. Cor.* 151, and the frequent expression *εἰς αὐτοῖον*, which however neither Demosthenes nor Aeschines seems to have used. But it is probably better to follow the other MSS. in the omission, or rather in the non-insertion of *εἰς*, as the *lectio difficilior*. The other emendation at § 166, *στέφνα* for *στενά*, is interesting (Mr. S. compares Cicero *Phil.* II. 86 'Num expectas dum te stimulis fodiamus?'), but it can hardly win its way into our texts.

The introduction gives a clear and readable account of the life and ancestry of Aeschines, and of so much of Greek history as is needed to make the life intelligible, and the two other speeches of Aeschines are briefly adverted to. The outline of the *Ctesiphontea* here given is substantially an abridgment of Blass's. The long Chronological Table on pp. xlviii.-lii. is unsatisfactory. Indeed Mr. Shuckburgh's grasp of chronological matters is uncertain and betrays him into grave inconsistencies. Some of the misinformation, however, of this Table is corrected (though, so far as one can see, the editor is unconscious of the fact) in the notes. Thus on p. 119 in the note on § 63, the date for Aesch. in *Tim.* is given 346 B.C.; in the Table, however, we have 345 B.C.: in the same note Aesch. *F.L.* is put into 343 B.C., in the Table, at 342 B.C. On p. 154, note on § 140, the seizure of Elateia is put 'into the winter of 335 B.C.'; in the Table, at June, 338 B.C. On p. 140, note on § 114, the date of Demosthenes's election as *pylagoras* is given as 343 B.C. (following Schäfer), and the Delian suit before the Amphictyonic Council was urged the same year; but in the Table the Delian affair is dated 345 B.C. Finally on p. 174, note on § 165, the defeat of Agis is given 330 B.C.; in the Table 331 B.C. This Table requires revision at many points, the most noteworthy being the following: 'B.C. 382. Birth of Demosthenes.' The uncertainty as to this date is in large measure removed by the recovery of fragments of Hypereides in *Dem.* (at col. xix. Blass), where Demosthenes is spoken of as over sixty years of age; as this speech was

delivered in 324 B.C. (Harpalus affair), the date of Demosthenes's birth would fall B.C. 385/4. This inference is confirmed (1) by Ps.-Plutarch, *Vit. Dec. Oratt.* 845 D. (from Caecilius?), where the archon in the year of Demosthenes's birth is given as Dexitheus (385/4 B.C.), the fact receiving independent corroboration from the statement that Demosthenes was thirty-seven in the Archonship of Callimachus (349/8 B.C.); (2) by the language of *Dem. adv. Onet.* i. 15 (867), on which compare Blass, *Chronol. Demosth.* pp. 2, 15, 16. To be sure Dion. Halic. *Ep. ad. Amm.* i. 4, p. 724 gives Demosthenes's birth year as 381/0 B.C. But, as Blass has shown, this date probably, as the dates of several of the speeches demonstrably, is reached only by conjecture and subjective combination on his part. 'B.C. 355. Demosthenes begins speaking.' But at least *adv. Aphob.* and *adv. Onet.* were spoken before this time. —'B.C. 346. Peace arranged (March).' Can 18, 19—24 Elaphebolion (*Dem. F. L.* 57: Aesch. in *Ctes.* 68, 69, 73) have fallen within March of this year? Ol. 108. 1 (B.C. 348/7) is agreed to have begun July 17. If this year were a leap year of 384 days (Unger) B.C. 347/6 would have begun Aug. 5, and 24 Elaph. must have fallen in mid April B.C. 346. If, on the other hand, (Boeckh, Schäfer) not Ol. 108. 1, but Ol. 108. 2 were the leap year, B.C. 347/6 must have begun July 6; since however the intercalated month was inserted between Poseideon and Gamelion, *i.e.* before Elaphebolion, it would throw 24 Elaph. practically just where it would have been had the year begun Aug. 5—into mid April. The equivalent for the subsequent dates (*Dem. F. L.* 57—60) should be corrected accordingly.

No mention is made whatever of the lodgement on the part of Demosthenes (and Timarchus) of their charges against Aeschines in reference to his conduct in the Second Embassy: this must have taken place within the short time after the offence was committed, the statutory limitation being thirty days, *i.e.* in summer 346 B.C. Under B.C. 345, 342, and 341 wrong dates are given and an incorrect sequence of events. The proper sequence is: Aeschines's prosecution of Timarchus; [the affair of Antiphon]; the rejection, by the Areopagus, of Aeschines as delegate in the Delian matter, because of his connexion with Antiphon; the speeches of Demosthenes and Aeschines on the Embassy. Now Antiphon was an Athenian who had been deprived of his rights as a citizen (*Dem. Cor.* 132), in all probability one of the considerable number thus treated, on the motion

of Demophilus, in the archonship of Archias (Androtion and Philochorus *ap. Harpoc. s.v. διαφήμις*), i.e. B.C. 346/5; hence this treasonable conduct cannot have preceded the Peace of Philocrates, and it is extremely improbable that either orator would ascribe to Philip—in the person of Antiphon—a willingness τὰ νεώρι' ἐμπρῆσεν within a year, or even within two years, after the striking of the peace. It seems probable, therefore, that the arrest and execution of Antiphon followed the prosecution of Timarchus by a considerable interval of time. (Indeed Aesch. in *Tim.* 77 refers to the διαφήμις as something very recent—νῦν.) It was doubtless meant by Demosthenes as a counter-stroke against the Macedonizers who had won the day in the matter of Timarchus. However all this may have been, it is at least certain that the speeches of Aeschines and Demosthenes on the Embassy were delivered—whether in the form we now have them or not is a question not to be raised here—in the summer of B.C. 343 (Schäfer, ii.² p. 373): now in Dem. *F.L.* 209 the rejection of Aeschines is spoken of as recently effected (πρόην), in spite of Aeschines's bitter and noisy protestations; on the other hand, in Aesch. in *Tim.* the Areopagus is represented as a venerable institution, not likely to make a mistake, in language which it is inconceivable that Aeschines could have used had he been smarting from the sting of a very recent adverse judgment.—The affair of the spy Anaxinus of Oreos can hardly have occurred as early as 341 B.C.; it must have taken place, if not after the declaration of war against Philip (summer 340 B.C.), at least only a short time before it; unquestionably after Oreos had been freed from the yoke of the Macedonizing Philistides.—'B.C. 338 June. Philip being chosen General of the Amphictyons marches south and seizes and fortifies Elateia. August. Battle of Chaeroneia...337. Proposal of Ctesiphon.' The main support of those who hold that Philip took Elateia in the spring or summer of 338 B.C., and not in the preceding autumn, is found in the documents in Dem. *Cor.* 154, 181, now however—i.e. by almost everybody since 1839—admitted to be spurious. The proper sequence of events in B.C. 339—336, inferred almost wholly from the explicit language of Demosthenes and Aeschines, is substantially this: B.C. 339. Spring; Aeschines stirs up Amphictyonic war against the Amphissians. Midsummer; special meeting of the Council with election of Cottyphus (so at least Aesch. in *Ctes.* 124,

128), unsuccessful campaign. Late summer or autumn; regular meeting of the Amphictyonic Council, when Philip was chosen general (Dem. *Cor.* 151 τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὁ Κόττυφος...ἤγαγε στρατιάν...ὡς δ'...οὐδὲν ἐποίουν, εἰς τὴν ἐπιούσαν πυλαίαν ἐπὶ τὸν Φίλιππον εἰθὺς ἡγεμόν' ἦγον): later, seizure of Elateia and punishment of Amphissians; formation of Theban alliance. B.C. 338. Late winter and spring, various military operations. Summer, (7 Metageitnion), battle of Chaeroneia. B.C. 337, toward close of Chaerondas's archonship, Demosthenes elected τελοποιός for subsequent civic year (summer to summer, 337/6). B.C. 336, winter or early spring: Ctesiphon's προβούλευμα, introduced certainly only after Demosthenes has completed a considerable portion of his year of service, and probably shortly before the Greater Dionysia. Aeschines's notice of the γραφὴ παρανόμων which immediately followed was served upon Ctesiphon while Philip was still living (Aesch. in *Ctes.* 219), and Philip was assassinated in the summer of B.C. 336.—'B.C. 331 Arbela (October). About the same time Agis is defeated. B.C. 330. The trial of Ctesiphon on Aeschines's impeachment [is not this an unhappy word?] comes on shortly before the Pythian games (in *Ctes.* 254); that is in January or February.' The fall of Agis preceded by only a short time the trial of Ctesiphon (when Alexander was in Parthia—i.e. midsummer B.C. 330—he received news of it), which took place in the late summer B.C. 330, not six months earlier. The more important reasons for adopting this time of the year are: (1) The archon in the year of the trial was Aristophon, i.e. B.C. 330/29 (summer to summer): cf. Plut. *Dem.* 4; [Theophr.] *Char.* 7; Dion. Halic. *Ep. ad Amm.* i. 12, p. 746, 5. (2) The Pythian games fell in the third year of each Olympiad (Pans. x. 7. 3; Diod. xvi. 60, i.e. the Pythian games fell in the archonship of Archias, col. 108. 3). As the Olympiads began in summer the Pythian games could have fallen within the year only after midsummer B.C. 346/3, 330/29, 326/5 etc. (Ol. 108. 3, 112. 3, 113. 3). Further these games fell in the Delphian month Bucatius (Boeckh, *CIG.* 1688, line 45; Köhler, *CIA.* ii. p. 319); and Bucatius was equivalent—not, as Boeckh (o. c.) maintained, to Attic Munychion, but—to Attic Metageitnion (Kirchhoff, *Monatsber. Berl. Akad.* 1864, pp. 129 ff.), i.e. to late summer or early autumn. (Of course no one dreams now-a-days that the Pythian festival fell in the winter-spring month of Bysius).—'B.C. 320. Death of Alexander' is of course a misprint for 323.—The date 'B.C. 314.

Aeschines dies at Samos' is extremely doubtful.

The notes are mainly exegetical; a sparing use is made of the testimony of the Scholia, but the parallel references are, perhaps, sufficiently full. The information upon political and legal antiquities might have been given with greater proportion and precision, as also that on historical matters. We miss a thorough treatment of Aeschines's language, and fuller citations of the rejoinders made by Demosthenes to the various assertions of Aeschines (for, of course, this speech will always be read in connexion with that of Demosthenes); the rhetorical aspects of the speech might also have been more fully treated. In all these respects Professor Richardson's recent edition, much more than an English version of Weidner, is distinctly in advance of this book. A cursory examination of a part of the notes suggests the following remarks. At § 2 the correct doctrine as to the *πρόεδροι* is given, but sharper attention should have been drawn to the fact that one *proedrus* was chosen from each of the non-*prytanising* tribes, and that the old office of *ἐπιστάτης τῶν πρυτάνεων* continued, with diminished functions, even after that of *ἐπιστάτης ὁ ἐκ τῶν προέδρων* had been established. To the literature might be added Professor W. W. Goodwin, *Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.* 1885, pp. 165 ff.—§ 27. The dates of Chaerondas should have been given.—§ 34. The late Professor J. M. Crow's able study of the Pnyx, including a survey and notes by Mr. J. T. Clarke, might well be added to the list of articles cited (*Papers of the Am. School at Athens*, vol. iv. (1888) pp. 205–277).—§ 55. *ὑπάρχουσιν* does not necessarily carry with it the idea of advantage.—§ 56. A note is needed on *μήτε...τε*.—§ 65. In the list of references insert §§ 61, 65.—§ 76. *προσκεφάλαια* cannot here mean 'cushions to rest the head against.'—§ 108. 'Ἀθηνᾶ *προναία*. The statement that 'the MSS. have *προνοία*, as in Pausanias, but the error has been corrected by inscriptions' is inadequate. The form *προναία* (Ion. *προνηρία*) is older than Aeschines, as the editors' references show (Aeschylus, *Eum.* 21, Herod. i. 92, viii. 27): it was also used by Callimachus, *Fragm.* 320, and Diod. Sic. xi. 14, and, as we are reminded, in Delphian inscriptions (e.g. Dittenberger, *Syll.* i. 169). But the form *πρόνοια* is also old, as in [Dem.] *in Aristog.* i. 33 (780), where the play on *ἀπρόνοια* makes an emendation impossible. It would appear, then, that the popular etymology had early transformed the form *προναία* to *πρόνοια*. Still, it hardly seems probable—unless,

against the judgment of most ancient and modern critics,¹ we accept *in Aristog.* i. as genuine—that this transformation had taken place in Aeschines's time; so that the emendation (first made by B. S. f) must be adopted, especially as Harpocration (*s. v.* *προναία*) seems to have had this reading before him.—§ 118. The knot or braid forming the *κρωβύλος* with its *τέττιξ* pin, whether we adopt Conze's, Helbig's, Birt's, or Schreiber's view on the subject, was at all events not fastened on the crown of the head, but was rather of the nature of a queue. Cf. Baumeister, *Denkm.* i. p. 616, and Purser in Smith's *Diet. Ant.* i. pp. 496 f.—§ 120. *ἐνῆρκται τὰ κανῶ*, 'the baskets emptied for the commencement of the sacrifice.' Rather should be said, with Weidner, 'the baskets filled for the sacrifices,' with sacred barley (*οὐλοχύται*). Cf. Schol. Vat. Laur. F.: *ἐπιτρέβεται τὰ οὐλα κ.τ.λ.*—§ 123, and Appendix C., on *ἐπὶ διέρες ἡβῶσι*. The important *fontes*, Bekker, *Anecd. (Lex. Seguer.)*, p. 255. 15 (*τὸ ἐπὶ διέρες ἡβῶσι τὸ γενέσθαι ἐτῶν ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἵνα ἡβῇ ἢ τὸ ἐκκαίδεκα ἐτῶν γενέσθαι*) should have been cited. Mr. Shuckburgh's ingenious suggestions can hardly be regarded as settling this difficult question.—§ 132. More should have been made of the Congress at Corinth (B.C. 338 autumn, not 337), in which Droysen and his school sees the fullest justification of the policy of Philip and stultification of that of Demosthenes and other members of the Anti-Macedonian party.—§ 150. Pheidias's Athena Lemnia was certainly not 'the chryselephantine statue in the Parthenon.'—§ 154. Not a special 'seat,' called *ἐφηβικός*, was assigned in the Dionysiac theatre to the *ephebi*, but rather a minor subdivision, a *τόπος* (Pollux, *l.c.*)—§ 187. The cult-statue, not the Metroum itself, was the work of Pheidias (*μητρὸς θεῶν ἱερὸν ἦν Φειδίας εἰργάσατο*, Paus. i. 3. 5; Arrian *Peripl.* 9) and even this cannot have been by Pheidias, if Pliny (*H.N.* xxxvi. 17) be correct in ascribing it to Agoracritus.—§ 187. It is not probable that Arrian (*Anab.* iii. 16, 7) and Pliny (*H.N.* xxxiv. 70) are right in ascribing to Alexander the restoration to Athens of Antenor's group-statues of the Tyrannicides: Paus. (i. 8. 5) and Val. Max. (ii. 10. ext. 1) ascribe it to Seleucus (Antiochus), which—as being the *lectio difficilior*—leaving wholly out of the question the sources

¹ Blass in his text edition (1888) does not bracket *Δημοσθένους* in the title of *in Aristog.* i.—of course an oversight—though he does so in that of *in Aristog.* ii.: in *Att. Bered.* iii. pp. 360 ff., however, he rejects both.

of Pausanias, is more likely to be the correct statement. Compare also Paus. i. 16, 3, where Seleucus—πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εἰσεβής—is credited with restoring to Branchidae from Ecbatana the bronze statue of Apollo by Canachus. § 225. Where does Aeschines say or insinuate that Demosthenes had at Athens 'entertained Anaxinus' and was 'believed to have been intriguing with the Macedonian Court by his agency'? This inference can hardly be safely drawn from the εἰσαγγέλλεσθαι μέλλον of Aeschines; and the ξένον αὐτοῦ γεγονότα of Ps.-Plut. Vit. Dec. Oratt. 848 A (which, however, has apparently no other source than this passage) refers rather to hospitality from Anaxinus at Oreus—probably as Athenian proxenus—at an earlier date, when the first Embassy (Dem. F.L. 163), or when the second Embassy (Dem. F.L. 155; Aesch. F.L. 89) went through Oreus. An εἰσαγγελία of this sort would have been an anti-Macedonian stroke of policy not to be expected of Aeschines at

this time. § 245. The speech in *Polycl.* is hardly Demosthenic. P. 266, note on § 212. Had Toup anything to do with the insertion of πρόσωπον?

The following confusing misprints, not already mentioned, are noted: p. vi. C. Weidner for A. Weidner. Notes: § 32, accusative; § 143, Lysides for Lysicles; § 159, Boehneck; § 171, καταγνώσκω; § 233, Blake for Bake; § 240, read Dinarch. i. §§ 18—20; § 242, read [Dem.] Halon. § 32. P. 271, dele καλκιδείς.

Mr. Shuckburgh's books being so deservedly popular in Great Britain and the United States, I felt that the reviewer's duty would be better discharged by pointing out for correction whatever seemed to be wrong or misleading, than by a mere catalogue of excellences which are generally acknowledged.

J. H. WRIGHT.
Harvard University.

BYWATER'S EDITION OF THE *NICOMACHEAN ETHICS*.

Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit I. BYWATER. Oxonii e typographeo Clarendoniano. MDCCCXC.

THE Delegates of the Clarendon Press may be congratulated, as every one will agree, on their publication of a text of the *Nicomachean Ethics* carefully revised by Mr. Bywater. He is not only a scholar among philosophers but a scholar among scholars, and probably no one in England could have done this particular piece of work so well: certainly no one could have done it better. He has brought to the task not only a long familiarity with the *Ethics*, but a wide and accurate knowledge of Aristotle's ideas and language, great care, great acuteness, great sobriety of judgment, all the equipment of perfect scholarship, and an unusually microscopic eye. Many therefore are the small changes, though not many the considerable ones, that those familiar with the older and much less critical texts will find in the new; and, though the editor fully recognises his obligation to the much improved text and the critical notes of Sussemihl, he has been able in many places to make an advance even on him. The advance however is mainly in those things which in no disparaging sense may be called

minutiae, and the real importance of such changes may easily be overlooked by the careless reader. A slight change of stopping, the alteration of one letter in a particle, the insertion or omission of some small word, often makes an important difference to the sense and gives a passage quite a new aspect. There is nothing brilliant or startling about such improvements and they often fail to meet with the recognition they deserve, for only scholars who are something more than scholars in the narrowest sense are likely to make them. They need a reasoning mind, which great acquaintance with Greek and Latin does not always carry with it. Many scholars can discuss the grammar of a sentence for one who can understand its real relation to what went before and what is to come after.

It will be understood therefore that Mr. Bywater treats the text in a very cautious and circumspect manner. He has introduced, I think, very few emendations of his own or of anybody else, except in the minute matters indicated above. A careful examining and weighing of MS. evidence and of the early commentators has been his critical method, and in this matter, as far as our present materials go, he has probably left little for the industry or acuteness of

others to do. His text is not only the best now, but likely, unless anything unforeseen happens, to remain so for a considerable time.

Without enlarging further on the admirable manner in which the editor has done what he undertook to do, namely to present us with a carefully revised text of the *Ethics*, I will venture in the exercise of a critic's privilege to call his attention to one or two things, about which doubt may be entertained, in those parts of his text which I have examined. In iii. 1, 17 he reads καὶ ἐπὶ σωτηρίῳ πίσας ἀποκτείναντες ἄν' καὶ θίξαι βουλόμενος, ὥσπερ οἱ ἀκροχειριζόμενοι πατάξουσιν ἄν, where πίσας and θίξαι take the place of the ordinary παύσας and δείξαι. Although there is evidence in favour of both changes and the second perhaps gives a better sense, something may be said on the other side. πιπύσκω is so rare a word that it seems rather rash to adopt it here, and, as to θίξαι, have we any authority for such an aorist (instead of θιγέω) in classical Greek? In iii. 11, 1 πᾶς γὰρ ἐπιθυμεῖ ὁ ἐνδεὴς ξηρὰς ἢ ὑγρὰς τροφῆς τὸ δὲ τοιαῦδε ἢ τοιαῦδε οὐκ ἐστὶ πᾶς, οὐδὲ τῶν αὐτῶν, can any justification for τὸ and πᾶς together be pleaded? And would not οὐδὲ τῶν αὐτῶν be a feeble and obscure repetition of the same idea? Surely what Aristotle wrote was τὸ δὲ τοιαῦδε ἢ τοιαῦδε (i.e. ἐπιθυμῶν) οὐκ ἐστὶ παντός οὐδὲ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀεί. Ramsauer has suggested παντός, as Mr. Bywater notes, but οὐδὲ τῶν αὐτῶν needs improving too. In the same book (iii. 8, 15) the MSS. have ἀπὸ ἐξέως γὰρ μᾶλλον ἢ (or ἢ καὶ) ὅτι ἦτον ἐκ παρασκευῆς in the argument that unforeseen dangers test courage better than foreseen ones. Mr. Bywater emends the words (which certainly seem to need emendation) by reading ἦν, ὅτι; but what is the force of the imperfect? Aristotle has not said anything to this precise effect before. He has said in 6, 10 that courage is shown especially on sudden dangers, but not that such courage is especially ἀπὸ ἐξέως. In ii. 7, 4 ἐναντίως δ' ἐν αὐταῖς ὑπερβάλλουσι καὶ ἐλλείπουσιν is Mr. Bywater's new reading for the common ἐανταῖς. I suspect Aristotle wrote ἐαντοῖς or αὐτοῖς. In v. 2, 10 is τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς προσταττόμενα, though found in K^b, really as good as τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς πραττόμενα? In the previous chapter we have ἀπὸ τῆς ὁμιλίας οὐ πράττεται τὰ ἐναντία, and the suitability of προστάττειν to ἀρετή may be doubted. In v. 4, 14. Rassow's αὐτὰ τὰ δι' αὐτῶν in the sense of 'just what, or just as much as, they had by their own labour' is not wholly satisfactory. In ii. 4, 3 πρὸς δὲ τὸ τὰς ἀρετὰς (ἔχειν) τὸ μὲν εἰδέναι οὐδὲν ἢ

μικρὸν ἰσχύει, τὰ δ' ἄλλα οὐ μικρὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ πᾶν δύναται, ἅπερ ἐκ τοῦ πολλάκις πράττειν τὰ δίκαια καὶ σώφρονα περιγίνεται I am rather surprised Mr. Bywater should suggest in a note that we ought perhaps to read εἴπερ for ἅπερ. As far as I can see, εἴπερ would give a very inferior meaning. The origin of τὰ ἄλλα would surely not determine their δύναμις. But ἅπερ is very significant: these are the important things and they are the very things that are created by habit, on which Aristotle is insisting.

The last point which I have noticed with doubt is perhaps the most remarkable in the new text. In the definition of virtue in ii. 6, 15 the editor prints ὁρισμένη λόγῳ καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ φρόνιμος ὁρίσειεν instead of the familiar ὡς ἂν. This he does on the authority of Aspasius, who commenting on Aristotle's words says καὶ ἐπεξηγείται ποίῳ λόγῳ τῷ τοῦ φρονίμου καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ φρόνιμος ὁρίσειεν. Even if Aspasius' own text is above suspicion here, are we absolutely bound to defer to it? There are many small things in which Mr. Bywater does not accept his authority as conclusive, and in respect of palaeography this is small enough. All the MSS. are against him. If ᾧ is masculine and means ᾧ λόγῳ, the καὶ is somewhat strange; if ᾧ is neuter, it is strange itself. Remembering the formulae ὡς ὁ λόγος &c. of the *Ethics* and ὡς ὁ νόμος &c. of the *Rhetoric*, we may feel that there is a great deal to be said for ὡς here. But perhaps I only cling to it because it is familiar to me.

It may be well to mention the reading that Mr. Bywater adopts in a few passages of well-known difficulty. He solves the difficulty of iv. 7, 15 οἱ δὲ καὶ τὰ μικρὰ καὶ φανερά προσποιούμενοι βανκοπανούργοι λέγονται by adopting Vahlen's omission of προσποιούμενοι, which leaves τὰ μικρὰ καὶ φανερά to be governed by an ἀπαρνούμενοι from the preceding sentence. v. 5, 12 εἰς σχῆμα δ' ἀναλογίας οὐ δεῖ ἄγειν ὅταν ἀλλάζωνται (εἰ δὲ μή, ἀμφοτέρως ἔξει τὰς ὑπεροχὰς τὸ ἕτερον ἄκρον), ἀλλ' ὅταν ἔχωσι τὰ αὐτῶν. οὕτως κ.τ.λ. he prints in this way with Mr. Jackson and Susemihl. (Is he really satisfied with giving ἔχειν τὰ αὐτῶν a different sense from that which it has twice in the preceding chapter and several times in other Aristotelian writings, and with calling people ἴσοι καὶ κοινωνοί who are not yet in intercourse and not yet equalized?) In vii. 3, 13 he of course joins καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ καθόλου κ.τ.λ. with the verb that follows. That puzzling person ὁ τὰ Ὀλύμπια νενικηκώς (vii. 4, 2) becomes ὁ-νικῶν in obedience to the Laurentian MS., and this disposes

of some hardly tenable theories about him. viii. 13, 9 receives a new punctuation which connects καὶ ὁμολογήσαι with the ἀναποδοτίον of four lines before, and a note suggests that καὶ ὁ ὁμολόγησεν should be read, though it is not adopted into the text. (But even thus the remainder of the sentence still needs change, ἡξίωσεν ἄν expressing wrong time as the words stand. This Mr. Williams probably saw. Ought we perhaps to read ἀδυνατοῦντι and understand or insert δοῖναι?) The very difficult passage in ix. 4, 4 appears with ἐκείνο τὸ γινόμενον bracketed (after Vermehren) as probably spurious, and with ἀλλ' ὡν ὁ τι ποτ' ἐστὶν referring to οὐδείς and not to ὁ θεός.

Mr. Bywater is so conservative an editor that he has usually not even indicated in his critical notes the passages in which some rearrangement of the order of sentences has been suggested. Many of the suggestions are however so plausible that I think the reader is entitled at any rate to hear of them and to be put in a position to judge for himself. Mr. Bywater has not entirely abstained from mentioning them, for he notes that in vi. 11, 6 some words 'alieno locoposita videntur,' and a note on vii. 9, 15 suggests a

transposition. Mr. Jackson's suggestions of extensive 'dislocations' in Book v. receive, I think, no mention. Entire sentences or passages have been called in question by various scholars, or notable theories of their relation to the rest of the text put forward, but all such matters are passed over in this edition. In this respect Susemihl's text will still be found more useful than that before us, and we may perhaps wish that Mr. Bywater had stretched his conception of a critical editor's function a little further.

This notice may conclude with an expression of special gratitude and one of regret. The gratitude is for the index. Every important Greek word or expression is carefully indexed and, what is more, the references are carefully arranged according to the nature of the passages referred to. Such an index will be a real assistance in the study of the *Ethics*, though it ought perhaps to be expressly stated in the book that it does not profess to be complete. The regret is for the fact that the editor has not added to his text the commentary which he is so particularly well qualified to write.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

ARISTOTLE ON THE CONSTITUTION OF ATHENS.

Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens, edited by F. G. KENYON, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, Assistant in the Department of Manuscripts, British Museum. Printed by order of the Trustees of the British Museum, 1891. 7s. 6d.

THE last two months of 1890 were rife with unpleasant surprises for men of business and with surprises, pleasant or unpleasant, for politicians; the turn of scholars came in the first month of 1891, and the surprise which was reserved for them was of a wholly pleasant nature. It came in the shape of an announcement of the approaching publication of the volume which now lies before us. Its appearance enables us to understand better than ever before how exciting and enjoyable a life scholars must have led in the days of the revival of learning, when one *editio princeps* after another issued from the press in rapid succession. It is true that among the *editiones principes* published in those days

there were works which that before us cannot pretend to rival either in literary value or in indisputableness of origin, but then they were works already known in manuscript, whereas the work before us was not known even in manuscript till it was published. It may be said with truth of the present volume that scholars of every type will find in it something to interest them and to call into play whatever aptitudes they may possess. Students of palaeography, students of questions of authenticity, conjectural critics, students of Aristotle and Aristotelian Greek, students of the Greek orators and of Greek inscriptions, students of Greek history and Greek antiquities, students of Greek orthography, will all find abundant occupation here. Our best thanks are due to the British Museum for the interesting volume before us, and they are heartily given, however much we may think that the text which they have published is susceptible of improvement.

The task imposed on the authorities of the British Museum was one of extreme diffi-

culty. A single glance at the published facsimile of the MS. will show how arduous the business of deciphering it must have been, especially in certain parts. Then came the task of filling up lacunae. Next came the question to what extent recourse should be had to emendation. We are not told how long a time the authorities and their editor reserved to themselves for dealing with these varied problems. It may well be that in their natural, and in many respects laudable, eagerness to publish a text they did not reserve to themselves a sufficient allowance of time. To print a wholly satisfactory transcript of the text of a unique MS., the writing of which is frequently dim or rubbed, and in which lacunae are of common occurrence and corruption may often be suspected, is a task of no ordinary difficulty, and to do it rapidly is almost impossible. Mr. Kenyon's text has evoked a perfect tempest of emendation, and there can be little doubt that many excellent suggestions have been made with a view to its improvement, though, so far as they were made without a knowledge of the MS. or the facsimile, their authors would not claim that they were final. Mr. Kenyon says with truth that 'in the present edition the matter of most importance is the text,' and his text would probably have profited if he had kept us waiting a little longer than he did. We should also have been glad of more information as to the state of the MS. than is given us in the foot-notes. No doubt this information is obtainable from the facsimile, but not all Mr. Kenyon's readers will be provided with the facsimile, and even those who are will be glad to be told, in immediate connexion with the printed text, exactly in what passages or words or letters the writing of the MS. is dim or rubbed or in holes, and for how many letters there is space in each of the lacunae. It would be an improvement if the foot-notes bearing on textual questions were separated from the rest and placed above them on the page, and if reference to the text were facilitated by a numbering of the lines in each page or chapter. An index of Greek words and phrases used in the treatise would also be a welcome addition. But we cordially recognise how much Mr. Kenyon has done in his notes to throw light on the historical teaching of the treatise, and also how welcome a contribution he has made to the task of collecting passages which seem to reproduce or to echo passages in it. His notes might have contained with advantage more frequent comments than they do on

the style and language of the treatise, and sometimes we miss a reference to Aristotle's *Politics*, where a reference of the kind would evidently be useful, but they are for the most part notes which we are glad to have, and they are all the more creditable to him, because they must have been produced under circumstances of considerable pressure. As to the Introduction, the account of the papyrus and of the MS. contained in it is indispensable and most welcome, but perhaps the part of it which is devoted to a restatement of the historical results of the treatise would have been more useful if it had been written in a somewhat less '*ad populum*' style. It is doubtful whether the writer of the treatise, or at any rate whether Aristotle, would have agreed with Mr. Kenyon when he says (p. xl.) that 'in the purely constitutional history of Athens Pericles is not a figure of any great importance.' By introducing pay for service in the dicasteries Pericles filled them with poor men, and thus secured to the demos exactly the point of vantage which it needed to become absolute master of the State and the Empire (cp. *Pol.* 2. 12, 3, 1274a, 3 *sqq.*).

We are not told how or when the papyrus came into the possession of the authorities of the British Museum, nor when or by whom the discovery of the nature of its contents was made. We can readily understand that it is not always advisable to disclose the channel through which papyri find their way into the British Museum, and though we should certainly have been glad if more could have been told us, it may well be that all has been said on the subject which it is expedient to say.

As Mr. Kenyon remarks, 'the last word' on the subject of the new treatise 'cannot be spoken for a long time,' and our attitude to it must be influenced by this fact. We are still far from the time when final conclusions can be arrived at with regard to it; we are not yet quite certain of its genuineness; we must be content for the present to examine and inquire. When 'Aristotle's Constitution of Athens,' or a large part of it, appears 'revisiting the glimpses of the moon,' we must receive it with the same mixture of inquisitiveness and respect with which the Ghost is received in Hamlet. We must put to it the questions which we are told in its pages were put to the incoming Archon at Athens, *τίς σοι πατήρ καὶ πόθεν τῶν δῆμων, καὶ τίς μήτηρ*;

Of the genuineness of the papyrus, on the under-side (or *verso*) of which the manuscript is written, and of the writing on the *recto*,

the experts of the British Museum appear to entertain no doubt. Neither do they seem to feel any doubt on the still more important question whether the writing on the *verso* is genuine. It is open only to experts to contest their opinion, and whether any experts will be found to contest it remains to be seen. It is needless to say that, if it should be contested with success, those of us who are not experts will have to be guided by the opinion of those who are. We do not learn from Mr. Kenyon whether it is common for papyri to bear writing on both sides, or rather for a MS. of considerable length to be written on papyri the *recto* side of which has already been covered with writing. Nor are we told whether it is common for contractions to be used in papyri as extensively as they are used in the MS. of this work. One instance at any rate is known to us of a Greek MS. written on a papyrus already bearing writing on the other side. We refer to the MS. of the Funeral Oration of Hyperides. Blass (*Hyperidis Oraciones Quatuor*, pp. xix., xxiii.) pronounces this MS. to be, though old, of little authority; let us hope that the MS. of the Constitution of Athens, which lays claim to a similar antiquity, may be at least as old, and also better. The man who planned the newly-discovered MS. would seem to have been a thrifty person. He used waste papyrus, and, thanks to a free employment of contractions, not a great deal of that. Who can tell whether any of the copyists employed on it were Greeks by extraction? The circumstance that 'some of the most remarkable forms of letters and abbreviations' which occur in the accounts reappear in the MS. (p. xiv.) is a noticeable one, especially as the MS. is thought to have been written as much as twenty years or more after the accounts.

Questions, however, relating to the papyrus and the MS. on its under-side will best be left to experts, and we pass on to the subject of the contents of the MS. The first question which arises in our minds on a perusal of the work is suggested by the startling character of a portion of its contents. We involuntarily ask, Can this treatise have existed in antiquity, and no hint have ever reached us from ancient authorities of some of the novel disclosures contained in it—no hint, for instance, of the fact that Draco gave Athens not only laws but a new constitution? How is it, again, that Plutarch is wholly silent in his life of Themistocles as to the device by which Themistocles helped Ephialtes to curtail the authority of the Areopagus? Plutarch's especial aim in

writing his biographies was to throw light on the character of his heroes, and he selects for narration those incidents which do this most effectually (Alex. c. 1): how is it that this incident is allowed wholly to escape him, for surely no incident could throw more light on the character of Themistocles than this? It is true that the writer of the Argument to the Areopagitic Oration of Isocrates does credit Aristotle's Constitution of Athens with the statement that Themistocles co-operated with Ephialtes in curtailing the jurisdiction of the Areopagus, and thus does in some degree prepare us for the remarkable story contained in the volume before us, but still we cannot help feeling surprised that the striking details of the story did not ensure its repetition by ancient authorities. Nor can it be said that this difficulty occurs to us only in reading the first of the two somewhat dissimilar parts into which the treatise falls, for the memorable narrative of the escape of Lysimachus, *ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ τυράννου* (p. 117), belongs to the second part, and it remains to be seen whether any allusions to this story are discoverable in ancient literature. No voice, however, has yet been raised to question or deny the antiquity of the work. Without attempting to forestall the verdict of palaeographers, which must be decisive in this matter, and subject to which all that is said in the present article must be taken to be said, we may remark that the work is one which a modern forger, however learned and adroit he might be, would find it difficult to concoct without exposing himself to the risk of detection at every turn. Nor would a treatise forged in modern times to represent Aristotle's Constitution of Athens probably be quite like that before us. It would approach Aristotle's extant works in style more nearly than this treatise does, and fewer words would be used in it which are unknown in them.

Other evidences in favour of the antiquity of the treatise are to be found in the repetition of passages from it in ancient literature. We must not indeed lay too much stress on the fact that almost all the passages which are testified to have occurred in the Constitution of Athens ascribed to Aristotle, and a large proportion of the passages which have been thought to belong to it, occur in the treatise before us. A modern forger would certainly take care to incorporate in his forgery as many of these passages as possible, and a clever forger might succeed in doing this without being detected. For the same reason we must not make too much of the fact that the first chapter of the work

on Constitutions ascribed (wrongly in all probability) to Heraclides Ponticus (see Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Gr.* 2. 208 *sqq.* and *Fragm.* 611 in the edition of the *Fragments of Aristotle* published by Rose in 1886) consists of statements made in the treatise before us, the only exception being the contents of the first three sections of the chapter (Rose, § 1), which refer to a part of the history of Athens dealt with in the missing commencement of the treatise. It has long been believed that 'Heraclides Ponticus on Constitutions' is based on the lost 'Constitutions' ascribed to Aristotle, of which the Constitution of Athens formed a part, and a forger would certainly bear this in mind in concocting his forgery. But we find in works which have not been asserted to stand in this close relation to the 'Constitutions' ascribed to Aristotle passages which much resemble, and perhaps repeat, passages in the new treatise. If we could be sure that the statements of Androtion quoted by Mr. Kenyon on pp. 58 and 81 were derived from the treatise, the question of its antiquity and of the date at which it was written would be effectually settled. But it is possible, as Mr. Kenyon points out, that the treatise may here borrow from Androtion and not Androtion from the treatise, and it is also possible that Androtion and the writer of the treatise may have used a common source. We come next to Theophrastus. Was the treatise known to him? We are certainly reminded of p. 43, 11 *sqq.* in reading Plutarch's account (Solon c. 31) of what Theophrastus said respecting Pisistratus' law against idleness, but we cannot be sure that he had the treatise before him. A nearer approach is made to the language of the treatise (p. 75 *sq.*) in Cic. *De Offic.* 2. 18. 64, Theophrastus quidem scribit, Cimonem Athenis etiam in suos curiales Laciadas hospitalem fuisse: ita enim instituisse et villicis imperavisse ut omnia praeberentur, quicumque Laciades in villam suam devertisset. It is certainly possible that Theophrastus here repeats what he had read in the treatise. Philochorus also, who died in B.C. 261, may have known the treatise. It is not merely that the fragments which we possess of his *Atthis* show that he often goes over ground already travelled in it (compare p. 9, 3 *sqq.* with Philoch. *Fragm.* 58; p. 15, last line but two, with *Fragm.* 57; p. 17, 3 *sqq.* with *Fragm.* 65; p. 81, 4 *sqq.* with *Fragm.* 122, referred to by Mr. Kenyon; p. 92 top with *Fragm.* 118; p. 122, last line but four, with *Fragm.* 152; p. 124 top with *Fragm.* 67, 68; p. 130 foot with

Fragm. 101); the language of one fragment (*Fragm.* 79b, *sub fin.*, μετὰ τοῦτον δὲ κατελύθη τὸ ἔθος (of ostracizing), ἀρξάμενον νομοθετήσαντος Κλεισθέους, ὅτε τοὺς τυράννους κατέλυσεν, ὅπως συνεβόλη καὶ τοὺς φίλους αὐτ...) certainly reminds us of the language of the treatise (p. 59, 1-3 and p. 61, 1-3). Aelian (*Var. Hist.* 8, 16; see Mr. Sandys in *Class. Rev.*, last number, p. 120) and Aristides (see Prof. J. E. B. Mayor in *Class. Rev.* *ibid.*) may also have been acquainted with the treatise. As time goes on many other passages indicating a knowledge of its contents may be discovered in unexpected quarters.

The question, however, may be raised—Granting the antiquity of the treatise, is it as old as it purports to be? Does it belong to the time to which it purports to belong? It undoubtedly purports to belong to the time of Aristotle. The facts to which Mr. C. Torr has called attention in the last number of the *Classical Review* (p. 119) appear to prove this of the later part of the treatise, and a fact may be added which appears to prove it of the earlier part. In the enumeration of changes in the Athenian constitution which we find on p. 104 *sqq.* no mention is made of the sweeping change in it introduced by Antipater in the year of Aristotle's death (B.C. 322), by which all citizens of Athens who did not possess property worth more than 2,000 drachmae—and there were more than 12,000 of them who possessed less than this amount (*Diod.* 18, 18)—were deprived of their political rights. The treatise evidently purports to belong to a time prior to the intervention of Antipater in B.C. 322, and it was revised and added to, if it was not written, after B.C. 329, for, as Mr. Kenyon points out (p. 137), there is a reference in it (*ibid.*) to the archonship of Cephisophon, and Cephisophon was archon in that year. This does not prove that it purports to have been written by Aristotle, but only that it purports to have been written during the latter part of his life. It may have been written, not by Aristotle, but by a contemporary of his—possibly by a pupil acting under his direction and supervision—but it certainly purports to be written not later than the year of his death. Does the treatise then read as if it belonged to this epoch? Till we have settled this question, it is difficult to decide to what extent we should carry emendation of the text, for much might be tolerated in a work considerably later than the time of Aristotle which we might find it hard to tolerate in a work of Aristotle's day. We may reply that nothing has so far been pointed out in it

historically inconsistent with the date to which it professes to belong. A question, however, arises as to its vocabulary. Not a few words are used in it which we do not expect to meet with in a work of Aristotle's day. Attention has already been called to this fact by Prof. J. B. Mayor in the last number of the *Classical Review*. Some of these are words whose existence was not hitherto known to us (see Prof. J. E. B. Mayor's list, p. 123). Others are words which appear to be found only in writers of a later date than Aristotle. Not a few instances of such words have been given on p. 123. Are the following words met with in writers contemporary with Aristotle—*ἐλεγεία* (p. 14: *ἐλεγίων* is the form found in the recognised writings of Aristotle), *νομοφυλακεῖν* (p. 24), *πρότυλον* in the singular (p. 42), *προσоргισθέντες* (p. 51), *παροργίζειν* in the active (p. 91), *ἐπικύρωσις* (p. 106)? We also find words used in a sense in which we do not find them used elsewhere (e.g. *προσεκεκόσμητο*, p. 36), or at any rate in writings of Aristotle's day (e.g. *ὑποποιεῖσθαι* p. 16, and *συνενημίθησαν* p. 104). It is no doubt true that some of the more remarkable words appear to be quoted from laws or other public documents, and that others are technical words likely to find a place in a technical composition like the second part of the treatise, and not to occur elsewhere, but then there are other words whose appearance in the text cannot be thus accounted for. Nor is the difficulty removed if we call to mind that in the *Politics* of Aristotle, for instance, words occur which do not occur elsewhere (e.g. *ἡπουθεν* δὲ 2, 5, 25, 1264 b, 9), or occur only in writings of a far later date (e.g. *συμπλείωνες* 3, 15, 16, 1286 b, 36), for words of this kind do not occur in the *Politics* as frequently as they do in the new treatise. It remains to be seen whether further investigation will reveal anything in the treatise historically inconsistent with the date to which it professes to belong, for if it should not do so and the difficulties of vocabulary stand alone, we might be inclined to account for them by supposing either that the inculcated words are not really as late as they seem to be, or that some later hand has been at work on the treatise and that its present form is not its original form. For to suppose that the work first took shape at a time much later than that to which it professes to belong and that its author succeeded so well in his effort to throw himself back to the time of Aristotle as to avoid all anachronisms, would be to suppose what is highly improbable. This holds good especially, but not

exclusively, of the second part of the treatise. In any case the occurrence of rare words in the treatise affords no proof that it is not the Constitution of Athens which formed a part of the 'Constitutions' ascribed to Aristotle, for in one of the few extant fragments quoted *verbatim* from the 'Constitutions' (Rose², *Aristot. Fragm.* 558) the rare middle *δυσανόητο* occurs.

If we ask whether the treatise is from the pen of Aristotle, we find ourselves on highly debatable ground. The whole question of style comes up for consideration. There is no doubt that the style of the treatise differs much from the style of the recognised works of Aristotle. It is a clear and precise, though a rather bald style, a style which has not the pregnancy which we associate with the style of Aristotle, and is also comparatively free from the ambiguities and irregularities which beset it. It is better in some parts of the treatise than in others. The dry way in which the sarcastic counsel of Damonides of Oea, the Ahitophel of his time, is repeated is not unlike Aristotle (p. 76, *συμβουλευόντος αὐτῷ Δαμωνίδου . . . ἐπεὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις ἡγῆατο, δίδόναι τοῖς πολλοῖς τὰ αὐτῶν*); none, however, of those simple and homely sayings, carelessly dropped but memorable for all time, which occur occasionally in the writings of Aristotle, greet us in the pages of the new treatise. But the mere fact that its style differs much from the style which we associate with Aristotle does not prove that it is not from his pen. The work before us is a narrative and descriptive work addressed apparently (if we may judge by the extent to which hiatus is avoided in it) to the world at large, not to the pupils for whom the recognised works of Aristotle were probably designed, and it is not likely that it would be written in the same style in which they are written. Some trifling irregularities of style, indeed, which we notice in the writings of Aristotle do reappear in the treatise. An anacoluthic passage occurs at the commencement of c. 15; words are now and then omitted after a fashion not unlike that of Aristotle (e.g. p. 84, 3); we have *μήτε* without any *μήτε* to follow it and taken up by *ἀλλὰ* (p. 43, 13 *sq.*), just as in the *Politics* (5, 8, 12, 1308b, 11)¹ and in the *Rhetoric* (1, 4, 1359b, 6); the expression *τοιούτης δὲ τῆς τάξεως οὐσίας ἐν τῇ πολυτείᾳ* (p. 13) reminds us of the use of *ἐν* in *De Gen. An.* 1, 1, 715a, 1, *ἐπεὶ δὲ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων μορίων εἴρηται τῶν ἐν τοῖς*

¹ The references to the *Politics* in this article are made for the sake of simplicity to the books in their old order.

ζῶσι, and the use of *τούτοις* in the sense of *τοῖς ἀποδοκιμασθεῖσιν* (p. 118, 6), of *καταχαρίζεσθαι* (p. 123, last line but two), and of *παρεγκλίνουσα* (p. 105, 3) is quite Aristotelian. A phrase like *δίκαιος πρὸς τὴν πολιτείαν* (p. 69, 7) of course at once carries us back to the *Politics* (cp. *Pol.* 5, 9, 1, 1309a, 36, τρίτον δ' ἀρετὴν καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν ἐκάσῃ πολιτείᾳ τὴν πρὸς τὴν πολιτείαν). We note, again, in the treatise, as in the *Politics*, an occasional conciseness of style verging on harshness. Thus we have (p. 147 top), *τὰς προβολὰς ἀπάσα[ς] εἰσάγουσιν οὐ[τοι] καὶ γραφὰς παρανόμων καὶ νόμον μὴ ἐπιτήδειον θείναι*, where Pollux (8, 88) substitutes for the last words *καὶ εἴ τις μὴ ἐπιτήδειον νόμον γράψει*. Still there are points connected with the vocabulary and phraseology of the treatise which make against the view that it is from Aristotle's pen. It is not merely that peculiar words occur in it which do not occur in Aristotle's writings; a graver fact is that common words occur in it which do not seem to occur in them. Eucken says of *παρανίκα* (Ueber den Sprachgebrauch des Aristoteles: Beobachtungen ueber die Praepositionen, p. 62), that 'it occurs, if he is not mistaken, only in spurious writings, and especially in the *De Plantis* and in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*' (see the *Index Aristotelicus s.v.*). It occurs, however, in the treatise (p. 79). *Δια[μπε]ρές* (p. 43) may be wrong or corrupt, but if it is not, a word is here used in the treatise which finds no place in the recognised writings of Aristotle except in quotations from the poets, so far at least as the evidence of the *Index Aristotelicus* goes. It has already been pointed out by others (*Classical Review*, p. 123) that phrases occur in the treatise which find no complete parallel in Aristotle's writings, and that *οὐχ οἷον—ἀλλὰ καί*, which occurs on p. 103, is not used by Aristotle. According to Eucken (*De Aristotelis dicendi ratione: De Particularum Usu*, p. 49), *δή* is nowhere found in the writings of Aristotle after a superlative; it occurs, however, after a superlative in p. 103, 14 of the treatise, *ἄμα*

δοκοῦσιν κάλλιστα δὴ καὶ πολιτικώτατα ἀπάντων...χρήσασθαι ταῖς προγεγενημέναις συμφοραῖς. It may be added that the resources of the writer of the treatise in the matter of connecting particles seem to be far more limited than those of Aristotle. In this respect the style of the treatise is quite unlike Aristotle's style, and indeed unlike the style of most genuine Greek compositions. The occurrence of *asyndeton* at the commencement of sentences (p. 98, 7: p. 103, 13) strikes us as strange, but this may be due to defects in the MS. But indeed, even if the style of the treatise resembled that of Aristotle far more nearly than it does, it would still be unsafe to rest on that ground alone a confident assertion that the treatise is from his pen. Not a few characteristics of Aristotle's style passed to pupils of his.

Let us apply another test. No writings are more familiar to Aristotle, or more frequently present to his mind in the *Politics*, than those of Plato and Isocrates. Does the author of the treatise show a similar acquaintance with the writings of these two men? For, if he does, he may well be—we cannot say that he must be—Aristotle. The answer is, that he shows a considerable acquaintance with the writings of Isocrates, and that there is at any rate one passage—further search may disclose many more—in which a reference may be suspected to a dialogue of Plato. We read of Pericles (p. 76), *κατεσκεύασε μισθοφορὰν τοῖς δικασταῖς· ἀφ' ὧν αἰτῶνται τινες χεῖρω* (should *χείρους* be read?) *γενέσθαι, κληρονομήων ἐπιμελῶς δὲ μᾶλλον τῶν τυχόντων ἢ τῶν ἐπιεικῶν ἀνθρώπων*. Aristotle often refers to Plato in the *Politics* as *τινες* (e.g. in 7, 7, 5, 1327b, 38 sqq.), and it is possible that Gorgias 515 E is here in the writer's mind. The evidences of his acquaintance with the orations of Isocrates are, however, far more numerous and less open to doubt. He uses Isocrates, and he also now and then tacitly differs from him. That he uses Isocrates, will be evident, if we set the following passages side by side:—

Isocr. Areop. § 67, οἱ μὲν γὰρ (i.e. the Thirty) *ψηφίσματι παραλαβόντες τὴν πόλιν πεντακοσίους μὲν καὶ χιλίους τῶν πολιτῶν ἀκρίτους ἀπέκτειναν*. (See also Aeschin. c. Ctes. c. 235.)

Isocr. De Pace §§ 86—88, and especially *τὰς δὲ κατὰ δέκα καὶ πέντε καὶ πλείους τούτων ἀπολλυμένας (τριήρεις) καὶ τοὺς κατὰ χιλίους καὶ διαχιλίους ἀποθνήσκοντας τίς ἂν ἐξαριθμήσειεν;*

Const. Ath. p. 95, *καὶ χρόνον διαπεσόντος βραχέος οὐκ ἐλάττους ἀνηρήκεσαν ἢ χιλίους πεντακοσίους*.

Const. Ath. p. 73, *αἰὲ συνέβαιεν τῶν ἐξιώντων ἀνὰ διαχιλίους ἢ τρισχιλίους ἀπόλλυσθαι*, and the whole passage.

Compare also the language of the treatise (p. 9) about the Areopagus with Isocr. Areop. § 37; the description of the position of Athens given in p. 65, 12 *sqq.* with Isocr. Panath. § 152, De Pace § 76, and Areop. §§ 51, 80, 82; the connexion which the treatise seeks to establish between moments of elation and self-confidence at Athens (*τὸ θαρρεῖν*, pp. 58, 67, 75) and constitutional changes for the worse with Isocr. Areop. § 3 *sqq.*, Panath. § 133; p. 106 *ἐν ᾗ κ.τ.λ.* with Isocr. De Pace § 79 *sq.*; p. 79 *ἀπὸ δὲ Κλεοφώντος κ.τ.λ.* with Isocr. Panath. § 132 *sq.* When the treatise in effect ascribes the fall of the earlier democracy to Aristides and his foundation of the maritime empire of Athens, it follows in the track of Isocr. De Pace § 64. Tacit deviations from the teaching of Isocrates may also be traced. In Areop. § 16 Isocrates speaks as if the constitutions of Solon and Cleisthenes were identical; this error is tacitly corrected on p. 81. In Panath. § 143 Isocrates maintains that the best *σύμβουλος* will also prove the best general; the writer of the treatise, on the contrary, holds (p. 66) that virtue is more necessary to the *σύμβουλος* than to the general, and in this he quite agrees with Pol. 5, 9, 2, 1309a, 39 *sqq.*, a passage which obviously refers, like the passage in the treatise just cited, to the rival claims of Aristides and Themistocles. So again in p. 21 *τὰς δ' ἀρχὰς ἐποίησε (Σόλων) κληρωτὰς ἐκ προκρίτων, οὓς ἐκάστη προκρίνει τῶν φυλῶν*, the writer adopts with a slight amendment the description given by Isocrates of the constitution of Athens before the time of Pisistratus in Panath. § 145 *περὶ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους καθίστασαν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς τοὺς προκρίθεντας ὑπὸ τῶν φυλετῶν καὶ δημοτῶν* (compare Pol. 5, 5, 11, 1305a, 32 *sqq.*, where the plan by which the tribes appoint the magistrates is praised by Aristotle).

This frequent agreement with Isocrates and occasional departure from his views is precisely what we expect to find in a treatise from the pen of Aristotle. But in one respect there is a marked dissimilarity between the new treatise and the Politics. The treatise is outspoken about the Athenian democracy, whereas in the Politics the Athenian democracy is hardly ever censured by name. It is only in the last chapter of the Second Book, a chapter the authenticity of which is very doubtful, that all reserve is thrown off on this subject. In the treatise, on the contrary, the Athenian demagogues are severely handled (p. 79), and regret is openly expressed that in the appointment of a certain official selection by lot has taken the place

of election (p. 134). It is not clear why, if Aristotle is the author of the treatise, he should be so much more outspoken in it than he is in the Politics. One might have expected him to be less outspoken in a work designed for general perusal than in one intended primarily for his pupils. Then again, language is used in the treatise about the Athenian demos, which strikes us as something new, coming from Aristotle. The reference, for instance, to *ἡ εὐθηνία τοῦ δήμου πρῶτης* (p. 59) reminds us of phrases in the speeches of Demosthenes (*e.g.* adv. Timocr. c. 51) rather than of anything in the Politics. A salient feature of the treatise, again, is its chronological precision. We are seldom left in doubt as to the interval of time which elapsed between one event and another; we are often told in whose archonship events occurred. In this it does not resemble the Politics; it resembles far more the writings of the Atthidographi. C. Müller says of them (*Fragm. Hist. Gr. I. lxxxvi.*) 'observandum etiam est Atthidum scriptores accuratiores fuisse in constituendis temporibus quam historicos superiores.' The narrative of the end of Aristogiton (p. 48 *sq.*) betrays the same liking for sensational stories as we trace, for instance, in Phylarchus. It is worthy of notice that not a single reference to any work of Aristotle's occurs in the new treatise; yet we might have expected it to refer, not indeed to works designed for the use of his pupils, but to other published works of Aristotle.

On the whole, there seem to be many chances against the view that the treatise is from Aristotle's pen. The facts which make in favour of that view are perhaps susceptible of another explanation, if guessing were in place. It is conceivable that matter dating from the time of Aristotle, and perhaps put into shape by him, has been worked up and recast by some other and probably later hand. But it is too early as yet to hazard hypotheses on this subject; our aim has rather been to examine and inquire. The ground is not as yet half explored. If further investigation should strengthen the case for ascribing the treatise to Aristotle, we shall all heartily welcome the result.

Some may be disposed to ask whether it is absolutely certain that the two parts of the treatise are by the same hand. On one point at any rate they are not completely in harmony. The rule of the Thirty at Athens is called a *τυραννίς* in the first part of the treatise (p. 106) and an oligarchy in the second (p. 129). Here the second part

takes the correct view, for Aristotle himself regards the rule of the Thirty as an oligarchy (Pol. 5, 6, 5, 1305b, 22 *sqq.*). Both parts, however, are alike in this, that they are fond of explaining proverbial sayings, nicknames, and the like (see the first part *passim* and the second, p. 117, ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ τυπάνου), and that they betray a dislike to extreme democracy. If either part was used in the preparation of the Politics, one would say that the second part is more likely to have been made use of than the first. It is possible that the description of the various kinds of trial for homicide contained in the second part (p. 144, 5 *sqq.*) was known to Aristotle when he wrote Pol. 4, 16, 3, 1300b, 24 *sqq.*, and that the information contained in the second part as to the magistracies of Athens was known to him when he wrote the eighth chapter of the sixth book of the Politics. In the first part, on the contrary, we are sometimes inclined to ask whether the Politics is not already in existence and known to the writer. Has not the writer of p. 106, 8 *sqq.* Pol. 4, 4, 25-31, 1292a, 4-37 before him? Compare also p. 26, 3 *sqq.* with Pol. 2, 12, 3, 1274a, 3 *sqq.*

How far is the treatise in agreement with the Politics on questions of historical fact? We note occasional discrepancies. Some of these, indeed, need not trouble us much, for the parts of the Politics with which the treatise in these cases conflicts are of doubtful authenticity. For instance, when the treatise makes Draco the author of a constitution, it comes into conflict with a doubtfully authentic passage, Pol. 2, 12, 13, 1274b, 15 *sqq.*, and the same is the case when, in making Pisistratus reign nineteen years, it comes into conflict with Pol. 5, 12, 5, 1315b, 31 *sq.*, where he is said to have reigned seventeen years, and also when, in making Themistocles co-operate with Ephialtes for the curtailment of the authority of the Areopagus, it says what is not said in Pol. 2, 12, 4, 1274a, 7 *sq.* But if it is implied in Pol. 6, 4, 19, 1319b, 23 *sqq.* that Cleisthenes increased the number of the phratries—and this Busolt seems now to admit (Staats-Altertümer, § 159, note 11: contrast Gr. Gesch. 1, 394, 5)—some want of harmony appears to exist between this statement, which occurs in a quite authentic passage of the Politics, and the statement of the treatise (p. 56), τὰ δὲ γένη καὶ τὰς φρατρίας καὶ τὰς ἱερωσίνας ἐλάσεν ἔχειν ἑκάστους κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. And can this statement as to priest-hoods be easily reconciled with the fact (Pol. 6, 4, 19) that Cleisthenes converted a number of private worships into a few public

ones? The constitution of Solon, again, is referred to in Pol. 3, 11, 8, 1281b, 32 *sqq.*, but not a hint is given us there or elsewhere in the Politics that under it the magistracies were filled by persons taken by lot from a larger number selected by the tribes. A close comparison of the two works may well reveal other discrepancies. On some matters, however, there is no lack of harmony. The view taken in the treatise of Pisistratus and Theramenes is exactly the view which we should expect it to take, though Aristotle nowhere says in the Politics what the author of the treatise says (p. 80), that it is characteristic of a good citizen to be capable of serving the State under all varieties of constitution in which law rules. The account given in the treatise of the ostracism and its object is also to a considerable extent in harmony with that which is given in the Politics. And if the policy of Aristides (pp. 67, 105) is placed in a less favourable light than we should expect, inasmuch as he is said to have converted a citizen-body largely consisting of peasants into an urban citizen-body subsisting on pay and exercising a despotic authority over the subject states, and thus to have contributed to the establishment of an extreme democracy, we remember that we are taught in the Politics (4, 6, 5, 1292b, 41 *sqq.*) to connect the establishment of a *τελευταία δημοκρατία* with a great increase in the size of the city and with the provision of pay, and also that Theophrastus' opinion of Aristides was not an altogether favourable one (Plut. Aristid. c. 25). The statement about Chios, Lesbos, and Samos (p. 67), may be reconcilable with Pol. 3, 13, 19, 1284a, 39 *sqq.*, if we take it to refer to an earlier time than that to which this passage of the Politics refers.

If we pass on to the question of the value of the treatise as an historical authority, we note in the first place that it is not in its earlier or historical section a contemporary authority for the facts which it relates. In this respect it differs from the histories of Thucydides and Xenophon, which deal for the most part with contemporary events. It rests on the testimony of earlier authorities, on the testimony of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, and on that of other authorities which it is not easy to identify. Occasionally it mentions that the authorities used by it differ among themselves (*e.g.* pp. 6, 41, 46, 48). More than once (pp. 16, 48) the version of an event given by the popular party (οἱ δημοτικοί) is contrasted with the version of the opposite side. It sometimes appears to make use of inscriptions (*e.g.* on

p. 100, and perhaps pp. 82—88 and p. 93), and especially of inscriptions recording decrees, though whether the writer had the inscription itself before him or found it reproduced in the pages of some earlier historian, it is difficult to say. If we could believe that the account which he gives us in c. 4 of the constitution of Draco is based on an inscription, his testimony would gain greatly in authority. But it is not easy to suppose that Draco's constitution was described in an inscription open to public inspection at Athens, when we find that other writers are absolutely silent about it. When the treatise comes to give an account of Solon's legislation, it makes far more conspicuous use of his poems than of his laws. It would seem from 'Heraclides Ponticus on Constitutions,' c. 1 (cp. *Const. Ath.* p. 104 sq.), to have given a full account of the earliest history of Athens under Ion and Theseus, and it would be interesting to know from what sources it derived this account. We often wonder whence it obtains the means of assigning a precise date to so many important events. Now and then, as we have seen, it appears to accept a fact from Isocrates, who is not a first-rate historical authority. Sometimes, as Mr. Kenyon points out, the version which it gives us of historical facts seems to be less probable than that given by others (see pp. 47, 98). Its view that Themistocles was still resident at Athens at the time when Ephialtes humbled the Areopagus is hardly likely to be correct. Inscriptions, however, both those already known and those which remain to be discovered, will furnish the best test of the value of the treatise as an historical authority.

The second or descriptive part of the work seems to be not only fragmentary and imperfect at its close, but also to be incomplete. Three important elective magistracies are mentioned on p. 110, those of the *ταμίας στρατιωτικῶν*, *οἱ ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν*, and *ὁ τῶν κρηνῶν ἐπιμελητής*, and though we learn something in the treatise of the functions of the two former magistracies, no systematic account is given us of the functions of any of the three. Perhaps an account of this kind was given at the close of c. 60 and has dropped out in a lacuna, for c. 61 begins *χειροτονοῦσι δὲ καὶ τὰς πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἀρχὰς ἀπάσας*, where *καὶ* seems to imply that an account of other elective offices, not concerned with war but with the *ἐγκύκλιος διοίκεσις* (cp. p. 110, 5—11, and for the contrast of *πόλεμος* and *διοίκεσις* Isocr. *Panath.* § 128), has been given in what precedes, whereas in

the text as it stands what precedes is a notice of the *ἀθλοθέται*, who were not elected but were taken by lot. We also miss an account of the great financial magistracy of *ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει*, and that may likewise have been given in the supposed lacuna. It should be noticed that the second part of the treatise deals successively with the deliberative authority, the magistracies, and the dicasteries, which is exactly the order followed in *Pol.* 4. 14—16.

If we ask whether the treatise appears to be the same as that which was known in antiquity as 'Aristotle's Constitution of Athens,' there seems to be much ground for an affirmative answer. It should be noticed, however, that passages are occasionally quoted by the lexicographers from 'Aristotle's Constitution of Athens,' which do not agree with passages on the same subject found in the treatise—instances of this are given by Mr. Kenyon on pp. 133 and 147—and that passages which we expect to find in the treatise are missing from it (see Mr. Kenyon's notes on pp. 79, 144, 155). One probable lacuna has just been pointed out, and may there not be others? Is it quite certain, for instance, that the account of Draco's constitution given in p. 9 sqq. is complete? We are told in the recapitulation (p. 105) that the laws were first put in writing by Draco, but nothing is said about this in p. 9 sqq. It is possible that the treatise has also suffered in other ways; it may have been altered and abridged, and it may have been here and there interpolated.

A few remarks on points of detail may be added before we conclude.

P. 21, note. It is probably by an oversight that Mr. Kenyon here ascribes the *Oration contra Neaeram* to Demosthenes, and the so-called Second Book of the *Oeconomics* (p. 125) to Aristotle. The intermixture of verses of Solon with the verses of Theognis is not due to Theognis, as might be inferred from p. 29, note. Much alien matter has been added to the poem of Theognis, but by later hands than his.

P. 48, 17 sqq. As to the last moments of Aristogiton, compare Polyæn. *Strateg.* 1. 22. Here Aristogiton closes the scene with an insult to Hippias, as in the treatise, though not with the same insult as is there recorded.

P. 53, last line. *πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἐνειμε πάντας εἰς δέκα φυλὰς ἀντὶ τῶν τεττάρων*. Should we not read *συνένειμε* in place of *οὖν ἐνειμε*? Cp. p. 104, *τότε γὰρ πρῶτον εἰς τὰς τέτταρας συνενεμήθησαν φυλὰς*.

P. 65, 4. *οὐδενὶ δόγματι λαβοῦσα τὴν ἡγε-*

μονίαν. This is said of the Areopagus to contrast it with the Thirty (cp. p. 93, 9 sqq. and Isocr. Areop. § 67) and also with the Four Hundred (p. 80 sqq.).

P. 71, 7. τοὺς ἀφαιρεθέντας τῆς βουλῆς. Not 'the persons despatched by the Areopagus,' but 'the members of the Council of the Areopagus selected and set apart for the purpose': cp. Aristot. Hist. An. 6, 22, 576b, 23 ὥρα δ' οὐκ ἀφαιρεῖται οὐδεμία τεταγμένη τοῦ ὀχέεσθαι καὶ ὀχεύειν.

P. 85, last line. πρῶτον μὲν ἱερῶν κ.τ.λ. Cp. p. 113 top, and Aeschin. c. Timarch. c. 23.

P. 93, last line but one. ἐκ προκρίτων ἐκ τῶν χιλίων, 'from persons selected out of the thousand,' if the text is correct. The 'thousand' were probably the Knights: cp. Philochorus, Fragm. 100, Hesych. ἱππῆς, ἱππεῖς.

ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ἱππῆς ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ χίλιοι.

Σύστημα πολεμικῶν ἀνδρῶν χιλίων ἵππους τρεφόντων, and see Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 1, 305.

P. 95, 12. ἐπεξαιρούμενοί τε τὸν φόβον. Does not τὸν φόβον here mean 'the object of terror'? See Liddell and Scott for this use of the word.

P. 111, 6. The use of μὲν οὖν here seems quite regular: see the Index Aristotelicus, p. 540b, 42, where Poet. 22, 1458a, 23 sqq. is referred to among other passages.

P. 135, 3. πολιτείας, not 'public measures in general,' but, as Prof. L. Campbell has already pointed out, 'citizenships' or 'grants of citizenship': cp. Dittenberger, Syll. Inscr. Gr. No. 134, ἀναγράψαι δὲ αὐτῶι τῇ πολιτείᾳ εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, οὗ καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ πολιτεῖαι ἀναγεγραμμέναι εἰσὶν, and No. 315, καὶ ἀναγράψαι ὅπου καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ πολιτεῖαι ἀναγεγραμμέναι εἰσι.

W. L. NEWMAN.

THE δαιτηταί.

ἔστιν δὲ καὶ εἰσαγγέλλειν εἰς τοὺς δικαστὰς εἰάν τις ἀδικηθῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ δαιτητοῦ, κἄν τινος καταγνώσιν ἀτιμῶσθαι κελεύουσιν οἱ νόμοι. ἔφεσις δ' ἐστὶ καὶ τούτοις.—Ch. 53 (last line but six).

To read δικαστὰς for the MS. δαιτητὰς introduces a serious difficulty. Before whom is the ἔφεσις or appeal to be brought? It would naturally be tried by a δικαστήριον: so that there is an appeal, on the same issue, from δικασταὶ to δικασταί!

'δαιτητὰς' is a remarkable confirmation of the view taken by Bergk of a difficult passage in Demosthenes' speech against Midias (89 f. p. 542). Strato of Phalerum acting as a δαιτητής had given a verdict against Midias. Midias waited for the last day on which the Arbitrators sat, a day on which attendance was casual (ὁ μὲν ἦλθε τῶν δαιτητῶν, ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἦλθε), and 'induced the president to allow an altogether illegal vote,' by which Strato was expelled and disfranchised. Bergk was the first to see what this implies—that the δαιτηταί formed a college, and that complaints against an individual δαιτητής could be brought before the δαιτηταί collectively. (Zeitschr. f. Alterthumswiss. 1849. See Meier and Schömann, Attische Process p. 333-334). Demosthenes speaks

of Strato's disfranchisement in terms which suggest that it was final. But this may be a rhetorical exaggeration: or perhaps Strato had appealed to a δικαστήριον and lost his case. (It has been suggested that τοῦτ' ἐχαρίσασθε αὐτῶι in § 91 implies this, but the inference is uncertain.)

Bergk proposed to emend the passage in Harpocration which Mr. Kenyon quotes:—(s.v. εἰσαγγελία: ἄλλη δ' εἰσαγγελία ἐστὶ κατὰ τῶν δαιτητῶν· εἰ γὰρ τις ὑπὸ δαιτητοῦ ἀδικηθείη, ἐξῆν τοῦτον εἰσαγγέλλειν πρὸς τοὺς δικαστὰς, καὶ ἄλλοις ἡτιμῶτο). Mr. Kenyon's own procedure shows that an editor would be tempted to alter δαιτητὰς into δικαστὰς. But it is also possible that Harpocration has condensed and confused the process, mentioning only the tribunal by which the ἀτιμία was finally ratified.

This procedure is to be distinguished from a mere appeal against the decision of an Arbitrator. A case tried by a (public) Arbitrator could always be referred to the higher tribunal of a δικαστήριον. But if the Arbitrator was suspected of having given a fraudulent or dishonest verdict, he could be arraigned before his colleagues and disfranchised, in which case he might appeal to a δικαστήριον.

W. R. HARDIE.

'THE DEPOSITION OF PERICLES.'

I wish to suggest, in the light of the new evidence, a different solution of the trial of Pericles to those hitherto attempted. Grote thought that, if Pericles was really deposed at all, it was before the elections of 430; so that Pericles was again strategus from July 430 to July 429, and presumably up to the time of his death. The view generally adopted is that of Gilbert. Accepting the view that the strategi were always elected on the 22nd Munychion, he supposed that Pericles failed to obtain re-election in Munychion 430, and consequently was not in office from Hecatombaeon 430 to Hecatombaeon 429. But, assuming that the MS. number 5 is right, we find from Aristotle¹ that the election of the strategi was held in the first prytany after the sixth in which the omens were favourable. This makes it possible that the elections of 430 should have been held in any month between Gamelion and Scirophorion. At the beginning of the war, the elections to the office of strategus were little more than a formality. The supporters of Pericles were in power, and it was of course necessary to elect men of military experience as far as possible; so that in the elections held early in 430 Pericles and his colleagues in office were re-elected. All this is quite clear from Thucydides. In the spring of 430 Pericles left Athens and plundered the coasts of Peloponnese. An attempt on Epidaurus failed. When he arrived back in Athens, in the summer, he found himself attacked on all sides. The people had been making overtures to Sparta in his absence. It is not at all probable that his chief opponent Cleon had anything to do with these attempts at peace. The fleet at once proceeded to Potidaea under Hagnon and Cleopompus, the intention being to attempt the capture of the town by assault. This plan completely failed: the loss through the plague was very heavy, and Hagnon returned, reaching Athens about July. Then, at the next ἐπιχειρονομία, soon after the time when Pericles and his colleagues had entered on office for the year 430—429, Cleon attacked him, having no doubt taken the opportunity of securing the support of the peace party. The result was that Pericles was suspended (ἀποχειρονοηθείς). Then he was tried on a charge of embezzlement and condemned. It

is not difficult to see why Cleon selected such a charge in preference to a γραφή προδοσίας. In the first place, he knew much more about finance than about strategy, and though he might bluster in the ecclesia at Pericles' cowardice, it was another matter to bring a charge of that nature against him before the heliasts. Also it would have been difficult to get the support of the peace party in such a charge; since Cleon would be bound to take the line that Pericles had been playing into the hands of Sparta instead of prosecuting the war with vigour.

At the beginning of 429 Potidaea surrendered, to the great relief of Athens. The siege had cost two thousand talents, a sum probably corresponding to nearly fifteen million sterling. Even in this estimate it appears that the cost of the unfortunate expedition under Hagnon is not included. A force of two thousand hoplites and two hundred cavalry was at once sent to the neighbourhood, with the object of restoring the power of Athens in Chalcidice. It was very important to prevent Sparta from establishing her influence in the north-east, and the expedition, which was under the command of a strategus named Xenophon who had been present at the siege, was regarded as being of considerable consequence. But the affair was a miserable failure. The commander-in-chief and the other two strategi who were with him all fell in a battle near Spartolus, and the troops returned without doing anything to retrieve the disaster. The Athenians must have regretted that Pericles was not in office; and it is likely that he had entirely retired from politics for a time, owing to terrible family troubles.

At the elections held this year, he was once more appointed strategus. In any case, the combination of different factions, which had been the result of peculiar circumstances, could not have lasted long, and the course of events since his deposition had not been encouraging. It may be doubted whether Pericles had to wait till the Panathenaic Festival to take up his duties. As three strategi had fallen in Chalcidice, it is possible that the ecclesia requested him to resume office at once, as we know that the ecclesia did sometimes appoint extraordinary strategi in time of war. The extraordinary powers over his colleagues were again conferred on him: but, soon after he entered on office,

¹ C. 44. I use the name to avoid an awkward circumlocution; not because I think that Aristotle wrote the treatise.

he fell ill with the epidemic. This, as Hans Delbrück points out, is perhaps the real reason why Thucydides anticipates Pericles' death.

A few months before the trial of Pericles Hermippus had ridiculed him for his faint-heartedness. It is probable that the elections for 430, such as they were, took place before the Great Dionysia, and also before the Peloponnesians invaded Attica. Whether the play was produced at the Lenaea or at the Great Dionysia, it is clear that the charge of embezzlement must be connected with Pericles' not very successful expedition in the early summer of 430. It is at least certain that when Hermippus' play appeared Cleon had only come forward as an opponent of the policy of wearing Sparta out.

Beloch's notion that there was an officer called *πρίτανις τῶν στρατηγῶν* receives no countenance from Aristotle. Indeed, it is clear that in ordinary circumstances the *strategi* had equal power. Still, it is only likely that in the war more cases of a *στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ* should have occurred

than in normal times; so that Gilbert may be right in his belief that Pericles was *στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ* in 431. But no argument as regards general practice can be drawn from occurrences during a state of war. If he was *στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ* in 431, he held that position till the Panathenaea 430. It is likely that the superior authority, when it was conferred, was given by a vote passed in the first ecclesia held after the new generals entered on office. The necessity of creating such an officer cannot have been foreseen so long before the new year as the time of the elections. Probably Pericles was not made *στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ* in Hecatombaeon 430, owing to the opposition now roused against him. This would explain why he had no power to hinder the meeting of the ecclesia after the Panathenaea of 430; for had he been *στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ*, he might have managed to prevent the *ἐπιχειροτονία* taking place. It also involves the conclusion that the famous self-defence was delivered before the Panathenaea of 430.

E. C. MARCHANT.

THE CONSTITUTION OF DRACO. Ἀθ. Πολ. ch. iv.

THIS chapter contains the account of a change in the constitution of Athens made by Draco. As Mr. Kenyon points out, we have no other record of any such change, and a well known passage in the *Politics* (ii. 9, 9, 1274b, 15) expressly tells us that Draco did nothing of the sort. It is therefore impossible that both these statements can be due to Aristotle. The latter part of the second book has long been suspected by critics, but before we accept the new account it will be well to examine it rather closely to see if it bears internal marks of genuineness.

This is the more necessary because there is considerable evidence to support the statement of the *Politics*—that what Draco did was not to make a constitution but to publish a code of laws in an existing constitution.

(1) No other writer knows anything of a constitution attributed to Draco; not even an author who, as Plutarch did, drew his information largely and quoted verbally both from the *πολιτεία* and also apparently from the authorities used by Aristotle in compiling the *πολιτεία*. For Plutarch when speaking

of the *θεσμοί* of Draco knows of nothing but a code of law.

Speaking of Solon he says:

(*πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τοὺς Δράκοντος νόμους ἀνέλε πλὴν τῶν φονικῶν ἅπαντας διὰ τὴν χαλεπότητα καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἐπιτιμίων* (ch. xvii.)) After finishing this topic he proceeds in chap. xviii. to give an account of the constitutional changes made by Solon. He did not then include constitutional arrangements among the *θεσμοί* of Draco.

(2) Other passages in the *πολιτεία* itself support the view taken by Plutarch and the *Politics*.

(a) In chap. vii. speaking of Solon, the writer, who is indeed here followed almost verbally by Plutarch, speaks of the *θεσμοί* of Draco in connection with the new code of laws made by Solon, and makes no reference to him in speaking of the constitutional innovations of the latter.

(b) In chap. xli. he recapitulates the main points of the history which he has just narrated, and refers to Draco in the following words:

(*μετὰ δὲ ταύτην ἡ ἐπὶ Δράκοντος, ἐν ᾗ καὶ νόμους ἀνέγραψαν πρῶτον.*)

The characteristic feature of the legislation of Draco is, we are here told, the publication of the law. This agrees with the account of chap. vii., of Plutarch, and of the *Politics*. It is inconsistent with chap. iv. : because there not a single word is said about the publication of the laws ; and instead we have described a very remarkable constitution ; one in some ways, as I shall show, more remarkable than that of Solon.

There is then sufficient reason for subjecting the statement of chap. iv. to a careful enquiry.

The passage is introduced in the following words :

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, χρόνου τῶς οὐ πολλοῦ διελθόντος, ἐπ' Ἀριστάρχου ἀρχόντος Δράκων τοὺς θεσμοὺς ἔθηκεν ἡ δὲ τάξις αὕτη τόνδε τὸν τρόπον εἶχε.

Now here ἡ τάξις is meant to refer to *θεσμοί*.

It is very doubtful whether the words used will admit this interpretation. Aristotle regularly distinguishes between *νόμοι* and ἡ τάξις τῆς πολιτείας. Cf. *Pol.* vi. 1, 5, 1289a, 15 πολιτεία μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ τάξις ταῖς πόλεσιν ἡ περὶ τὰς ἀρχάς—νόμοι δὲ κεχωρισμένοι τῶν δηλούντων τὴν πολιτείαν, καθ' οὓς δὲ τοὺς ἀρχοντας ἀρχεῖν κ.τ.λ. Cf. also 1286a, 3.

This distinction is maintained in this work, cf. chap. vii. and ix. (the rule however is not invariable, cf. ch. xxxiv.).

This seems to be more true of the word *θεσμοί*. *θεσμοί* is a very rare word in prose : and where it occurs in Attic prose it seems always to refer directly to the *θεσμοί* of Draco except in a few passages where it is used metaphorically. Plato *Phaedrus* 248 C uses the expression *θεσμοὶ τῆς Ἀδραστίας*, and in Pseudo-Arist. *περὶ κοσμοῦ* 6, 401a, 10 we read of *θεσμοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ*. There seems to be no other case of its use in Aristotle or Plato (except in the *Epistles*), and none in the Orators except in reference to Draco, cf. also Herod. iii. 31. The word and also the kindred *θέσμια* are both used more than once in this work. In the passage of Solon quoted p. 31 :

θεσμούς θ' ὁμοίους τῷ κακῷ τε κάγαθῷ,
εὐθείαν εἰς ἕκαστον ἀμόσας δίκην,
ἐγραψα.

it obviously refers simply to the ordinances of a code of law. In chap. xvi. if Mr. Kenyon's emendation is correct ἐν τε γὰρ τοῖς θεσμοῖς φιλάνθρωπος ἦν : the use is the same (but I expect *θεσμοί* is the word here). In chap. xxxv. he says οἱ τριάκοντα—καθεῖλον—καὶ τῶν Σόλωνος θεσμῶν ὅσοι διαμφοσβητήσεις εἶχον. Here the context shows that the word has reference only to the Solonian code, and not to the constitution.

Chap. vii. I have already referred to : the word here is used as synonymous with *νόμος* and contrasted with *πολιτείαν* ἔταξεν.

We are then I think justified at looking at the sentence as it stands with great suspicion.

Let us now turn to the provisions of the constitution.

I think I can show that

(1) At least one of these could not possibly have been devised in Draco's time. Nearly all of them are very difficult to reconcile with what we know of the state of Athens at the time : and some of them are inconsistent with other statements in this book.

(2) None of the provisions, some of them very remarkable ones, are ever quoted by any of the writers who used the work.

(3) The whole constitution is just like those described later in the book in connection with the aristocratic revolutions in 411.

I. The property qualification for the Archonship is 10 minae. At this time property was, as we know, reckoned not in money but in corn.

10 minae is equal to a 1000 drachmas. The qualification of a *ζεγγίτης* was to possess land capable of producing 200 *μέδμοι* : a *μέδμος* of corn was worth at this time about a drachma (Plut. *Solon* 23, quoting a law of Solon). Land of this extent must have been worth not less than 2000 drachmas. According to this men were eligible to the archonship who were excluded by Solon from all office.

II. Men are eligible to the office of *στρατηγός* and *ἵππαρχος* who possess 100 minae, and have children over ten years of age by a wedded wife.

As to this—

(a) We have no other record of *στρατηγοί* at this time : in chap. vii. where a considerable list of officials is given they are not mentioned.

(b) The clause that they must have children is also quite new.

(c) If there were *στρατηγοί* they held only an inferior position, and the very high property qualification is unaccountable.

III. In the next sentence the mention of *πρωτάνεις* causes much difficulty. Who were they ? Were they the same as the *ἀρχοντες* ? If so, why is this not explained in chap. iii. ?

IV. The council of 401 is quite new. Moreover in chap. viii. Aristotle speaking of Solon says : βουλὴν δὲ ἐποίησε τετρακοσίους, ἑκατὸν ἐξ ἑκάστης φυλῆς. This does not mean, as Mr. Kenyon suggests, that he altered the

number of members from 401 to 400, but 'he set up a council of 400.' The new council of 400 is contrasted with the old council of the Areopagus. So Plutarch also took it, chap. xix. : συστησάμενος δε τὴν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῃ βουλὴν... δευτέραν προσκατένευε βουλὴν.

V. κληροῦσθαι δὲ καὶ ταύτην καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρχὰς τοὺς ὑπὲρ τριάκοντα ἐτηγεγονότας, καὶ δις τὸν αὐτὸν μὴ ἀρχεῖν πρὸ τοῦ πάντας περιελθεῖν. The rotation of all in office was a well-known device of later times: but how was it applicable to a large body of citizens, most of whom lived at a considerable distance from Athens? It was in fact the mark of a developed democracy (Ar. Polit. vi. 10, 3, 1298a, 10).

VI. The next clause shows that the writer imagines that this βουλὴ had the probouleutic duties of the later βουλὴ. Is not this an anachronism?

The fact is that the whole of this constitution is a complete anachronism. It shows in every line the influence of the political principles which prevailed among the moderate aristocratic party at Athens from the end of the 5th century. The only constitutions that we know which really are like it are those proposed in the year 411 by the party of Theramenes.

The following resemblances are particularly striking:

(1) ἀπέδεδότο ἡ πολιτεία τοῖς ὅπλα παρεχομένοις. Cf. Thuc. viii. 97: Ar. πολ. τ. Αθ. 33: Xen. Hell. ii. 3.

(2) The small property qualification for the archons.

From chap. 29 we learn that in the constitution there described the archons and Prytanes alone were to receive pay: they had two obols a day. This implies that no high property qualification was required. The high qualification for the generals would be perfectly natural at this later period, but not in 621.

(3) The βουλευτής to be fined for non-attendance.

The only instance of such a law at Athens is given in this work in chap. 30 where the constitution of the 400 is described.

(4) The mention of πρυτάνεις—στρατηγοί—ἑπαρχοί belongs to a later period; as does the rotation in office, and the relations of the βουλὴ to the ἐκκλησία.

The examination thus completely confirms the suspicions caused by the absence of external support. It also, I think, shows the origin of the insertion.

The constitution described betrays the

thought of a particular party; the reformers of this school used to advocate their policy by maintaining that it really would restore Athens to the condition in which it was before the democratic changes began. Many as we know looked on Solon as the originator of the changes which they deplored (Ar. Polit. ii. 9). They would then recommend a constitution of this kind by saying it was like that which prevailed in Athens before the time of Solon. This has misled some transcriber or editor. After the words τοῖς θεσμοῖς ἔθηκεν, influenced by the expression at the beginning of chap. iii. he desiderated some account of the constitution in the time of Draco (it is possible that the expression of the Politics xii. 1274 πολιτεία ὑπαρχούση τοῖς νόμοις ἔθηκεν represents some words which have fallen out of the text) and inserted this passage out of some other book.

If the whole passage be omitted and θεσμοί regain its natural meaning of 'a code of law,' then the clauses at the end of the chapter will acquire much more point.

Draco published his code of law, but the Areopagus maintained its position and had to guard the [new] laws. And any person who had been maltreated could go to the Areopagus and show them which of the [new] laws had been broken.'

JAMES W. HEADLAM.

Ch. 22, p. 60. ἐκνέμεσαν τοὺς ἐννέα ἄρχοντας . . . τοῖς μετὰ τὴν τυραννίδα πρώτον. It is scarcely possible to get a satisfactory sense out of τοῖς. τοὺς has been proposed: τότε is as probable an emendation, and τότε πρώτον would give a better antithesis to the next clause (οἱ δὲ πρότεροι πάντες ἦσαν αἰρετοί).

Ch. 23, p. 66. ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν ἀπόστασιν τὴν τῶν Ἰόνων καὶ τὴν τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων συμμαχίαν Ἀριστείδης ἦν ὁ προτρέψας. The sense of this passage, as it stands, is in complete conflict not only with the statements in other authors, but with the general argument of the writer. Aristides really urged the Athenians to make an alliance with the Ionians, and to draw apart from the Lacedaemonians. Is it not possible that the transcriber has transposed ἀπόστασιν and συμμαχίαν (perhaps because they occurred at the end of two successive lines in his original)? It is true that Athens did not at once formally break with the general Greek alliance, but the term ἀπόστασις might fairly be applied to the division between the Greek states caused by the formation of the separate confederacy.

Ch. 28, p. 78. καὶ χρόνον μὲν τινα διεδίδον,

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα κατέλυσε Καλλικράτης κ.τ.λ. Cleophon is credited with the first introduction of the diobely; Callicrates with increasing it to three obols. Surely κατέλυσε is inappropriate. A man who increased a payment from two obols to three could not be said to abolish the earlier payment. I propose κατηύξησε; the compound does not occur elsewhere, but it would naturally have the sense of 'corruptly' or 'wastefully increasing'; cf. *Politics*, ii. 1271a, 3 καταδωροδοκούμενοι καὶ καταχαριζόμενοι. The passage raises other points of interest. Mr. Wyse suspects διεδίδον and proposes διεδίδωτο. But if Cleophon held a financial office (as is probable from Lys. xix. 48) the active voice would be appropriate. Dr. Beloch has argued with much ingenuity that Cleophon was for some years a member of the board of πορισταί (*Rhein. Mus.* xxxix. pp. 249 ff.). The use of the word διεδίδον and still more the use of the verb πορίζειν in this passage confirm his argument. Lastly it is not quite certain that the δωβελία is to be identified with the Theoric distribution. Dr. Beloch (*ib.* pp. 239 ff.) argues that the two obols referred to in Ar. *Ran.* 140 and the δωβελία so frequently mentioned in inscriptions really denote the dicast's fee, and that it was re-introduced in 410 at the rate of two obols. This theory is confirmed by the reference to Callicrates quoted by Mr. Kenyon. At the same time the use of the word πρῶτος seems to point to the introduction of a new institution, and not to the restoration of an old one.

L. WHIBLEY.

C. 25.—As regards the story of Themistocles and the Areopagus, if it is true, there arise more difficulties as to chronology than those mentioned in Mr. Kenyon's note. Thucydides says (i. 137) that Themistocles was brought by a storm to Naxos on his flight to Asia at the time of the siege of that island by the Athenians. No one dates this siege later than 465 (Pierson); Schäfer puts it in 466, Krüger even in 473. And yet, according to this story, Themistocles was in Athens in 462. It is not possible to suppose that Themistocles had been intriguing with Ephialtes against the Areopagus for some years previously, and that some time elapsed between his ostracism and the fall of the Areopagus; for the two events are immediately connected in this version.

GEORGE F. HILL.

c. 52. ἂν μὲν ὁμολογῶσι, θανάτῳ ζημώσονται, ἂν δ' ἀμφισβητῶσιν, εἰσάγοντας εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον. In the editor's note this is interpreted so as to agree with the statements in the lexicographers, who understand ὁμολογῶσι of the confession of the accused. A writer in the *Saturday Review* for March 21 points out that the true rendering of the passage is, 'There are also appointed by lot officers called *The Eleven*, whose functions are to take charge of prisoners, and in the case of those arrested for thieving, robbery, or brigandage, to inflict, if they are unanimous, the penalty of death, or if they disagree, to bring them before the ordinary court.'

WICKHAM'S HORACE, VOL. II.

The Works of Horace. Vol. II. *The Satires, Epistles, and De Arte Poetica* by E. C. WICKHAM, M.A., Master of Wellington College, and formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1891.

THE first volume of Mr. Wickham's Horace, which appeared in 1874, bore evident traces of being a labour of love. It did not profess to make substantial additions to our knowledge of Horace or of Latin, but it was appreciative and elegant, and contained in the way of translation some examples of highly ingenious and delicate phrase-making. Faculties of this nature sink into quite a

subordinate place when an editor comes to deal with the *Satires* and *Epistles*, which are full of difficulties for the interpreter and present still (in spite of much that has been urged to the contrary) some passages where the art of textual criticism must be brought to bear on the words of the poet. It is not surprising that an admirer of the *Odes* should be even somewhat repelled by the *Satires* and *Epistles*, and that he should feel that qualities of mind valuable in handling the one are of little use in dealing with the other. It would have been hard indeed for Mr. Wickham to make his second volume as acceptable to the world of teachers and of learners as his first was. The first volume

entered on a comparatively unoccupied field as regards English editions; in the long interval which elapsed before the appearance of the second volume, its ground had been thoroughly explored by two eminent scholars and all its material had been thoroughly sifted and analysed. The *Satires* by Professor Palmer and the *Epistles* by Professor Wilkins, though appearing in a series which does not profess to aim so high as the Clarendon Press, must be at once seen to represent a far higher standard of scholarship than Mr. Wickham's edition. He has made abundant use of the materials of both editors, but has not caught the spirit of either. There is a certain apathy and lack of interest in his work which contrasts greatly with the enthusiastic search for truth which characterises that of Professors Palmer and Wilkins.

In *Sat.* i. 3, 120

Nam ut ferula caedas meritum maiora subire
Verbera non vereor

we have a reading which, as long as it stands in the text of Horace, is a standing argument that there is no such thing as a science of grammar. If *vereor ut* may in one passage in Latinity and in one only—for the alleged parallels are obviously irrelevant—signify 'I fear you will,' then any deviation from any grammatical rule in any case and in any author is admissible. What should we say if we were told that in one passage only in English literature 'I have my doubts about his succeeding' meant 'I fear he will succeed'? Now the case is far stronger against the possibility that a Latin writer should use *vereor ut caedas* in the sense of 'I fear that you will scourge' against the consentient practice of Latin writers of all ages and conspicuously against his own.¹ Yet on this passage Mr. Wickham does not even mention Palmer's conjecture of *nunc* for *non* which completely restores the sense and saves the grammar. He quotes in mitigation of the violation of grammar (which he calls 'the departure from the usual rule which would have required *ne* instead of *ut*') a passage in which *ut* is not in syntactical connexion with the verb of 'fearing' at all; and he says that an obviously untenable rendering proposed in the *Journal of Philology* 'may be right.' Here, again, is a note which makes one think the editor had not his own text before him when he was writing it; or is it possible

¹ Cp. O puer, ut sis vitalis metuo *Sat.* ii. 1, 60; *ne* quid deperdat metuens aut ampliut ut rem i. 4, 31.

that any one has proposed to read *in chartis*? The passage is *Sat.* i. 4, 132

ubi quid datur oti

Illudo chartis.

The note is:—'*Illudo chartis.* The depreciatory use of "ludo" of a man's own compositions (as in *Sat.* i. 10. 37, see on *Od.* i. 32. 2) with the addition *in chartis*. Horace is giving a final account of his writing of Satire. It is his playful and childlike method of self-rebuke and self-instruction.' But is it not a playful and childlike way of explaining a very difficult expression *illudo chartis* to treat *illudo* as if it were *ludo*, and *chartis* as if it were *in chartis*? The difficult phrase *illudo chartis* has been rightly understood by a scholiast and rightly explained by Palmer who quotes him; Mr. Wickham explains a phrase *ludo in chartis*, which, if any Latin writer had used it, would not seem to require explanation. If he really holds that *illudo chartis* = *ludo in chartis* he should have said so, and should have adduced reasons for holding this view, and examples supporting it.

In i. 5, 89

venit vilissima rerum

Hic aqua, sed panis longe pulcherrimus

surely the antithesis shows that the meaning is 'here you have to buy the worst water in the world,' not 'here water, the cheapest thing in the world, has to be bought.' Mr. Wickham follows Orelli in the latter explanation, and does not mention the former.

One naturally turns to i. 6, 75 and thus finds one's old friend *octonis referentes Idibus aera* which of course may be right; but if I had no better argument against *octonos... aeris* than that it introduces a new *s* into a verse where there are already as many as we want of that letter, I should prefer to fall back on the good old plan that I liked the old *mumpsimus* better than the new *sumpsimus*.

Just as Mr. Wickham explained *illudo chartis* as if Horace had written *in chartis ludo*, but without suggesting that *illudo chartis* could really be the same as *ludo in chartis*, so in the very vexed passage i. 6, 12, 6 where V. has *lusumque trigonem*, a reading which has been accepted by most editors since Bentley demonstrated the ineptitude of *rabiosi tempora signi*, he gives in his text *lusumque trigonem*, but renders it in his note 'the game of three, a game of ball.' But *ludum* would have been the word used for 'a game'; the words must mean 'the (game

of) ball already played by me.' This is the poet's brief way of mentioning that he had already played a game of ball though he had not mentioned it. He writes that 'Munro thinking *trigon* was the ball itself would either take *lusum* as a participle = *elusum* "cheated, left in the lurch," or alter it to *pulsum*.' Hence Mr. Wickham seems to think if *trigon* is not the ball itself *lusum* may be something other than a participle. What then is *lusum*? If Horace meant to speak of a 'game' he would certainly have written *ludum*.

In i. 9, 36

et casu tunc respondere vadato
Debebat

Mr. Wickham says that *vadato* is dative. But *respondere* in this sense is always used absolutely, and elsewhere *vadatus* is always passive 'held to bail.' Hence it seems far better to take *vadato* as an impersonal ablative 'bail having been given for his appearance,' like *intestato*, *inauspicato*. It was the feeling that *respondere* must be absolute and *vadato* passive which led Bentley to read *vadatus* 'having been held to bail.' What was needed for the defence of the text was an exact parallel to *vadato* taken as an impersonal ablative absolute. This Mr. Palmer supplied by adducing *hoc quod satisdato debeo* Cic. Att. xvi. 6, 3, 'security having been given.' This would seem to settle the question, but Mr. Wickham does not mention it.

ii. 2, 123

Post hoc ludus erat culpa potare magistra.

One looks to this verse to see how an editor will treat the comment of Porphyryon. Mr. Wickham's observation is 'His explanation suggests, though it does not say, that *culpa* had some technical sense.' Mr. Palmer's is 'This shows he simply knew nothing whatever about it,' and one feels strongly disposed to agree with the latter view. But let not the delightful rendering of M'Caul lack our humble tribute, 'each person took as much as he pleased, restricted only by the feeling that excess was culpable'! Perhaps *imbibed* instead of *took* would render this version perfect as a reproduction of the spirit as well as the manner of Horace.

In ii. 8, 6 no notice is taken of a nice grammar point; *leni fuit Austro captus aper* means 'there was a boar caught' &c. not 'the boar was caught' &c., a rendering into which the uncautioned learner will certainly fall.

The *Epistles* do not present the same kind of difficulties as the *Satires*, and Mr. Wickham would seem to have felt more interest in his task of editing them. The tone and topics are often very like those of the *Odes*, and if the editor has not always satisfactorily traced the train of thought, he is in this matter as successful as his predecessors have been or his successors are likely to be. But in explanation and criticism he does not seem to have much of his own to offer, and does not always seem to choose the best of the suggestions of others. Surely *olus omne* (i. 5, 2) is not 'a mess of vegetables'; *ingenuis* i. 19, 34 demands a note such as Mr. Wilkins has given, and the same may be said of *deserat* i. 20, 10; and in rendering *honoratum Achillem* (A.P. 120) 'the time-honoured character of Achilles' he has suggested an impossible meaning for the participle. Again, Haupt's *victo ridens* seems an almost certain correction of *victor violens*, a most unmeaning expression, in i. 10, 37. This conjecture however Mr. Wickham, though he does not accept it, at least mentions; an honour which he might have paid to a conjecture which has found so much favour in recent times as Ribbeck's *momen* for *nomen* in A.P. 253.

Of many of the notes we have nothing to say except that while they are useful and good, as far as they go, they are neither so useful nor so good as those of the edition by Mr. Wilkins which already holds the field. A comparison of the two editions will settle this question; we have formed our opinion on an examination of several passages containing matter of interest from the point of view of the grammarian and the student of history and archaeology: among these are *maiora minorare fama* Ep. i. 11, 3; *utroque pollice* i. 18, 66; *puteal Libonis* i. 19, 8—9; *frater ut alter* ii. 2, 87; *palus divi* A.P. 65; *cantor* A.P. 155; *quarta persona* A.P. 192.

The last few years have been rather rich in floating comments on Horace in the magazines both German and English. Messrs. Housman, Postgate and Palmer have all made interesting and instructive suggestions, some of which at least deserved to be mentioned in a large and handsome edition like the present. I will mention only one here—a suggestion made by Mr. Housman on a much vexed passage—which seems to me as convincing as it is simple, and which could not fail to be interesting to students of Horace. He thus punctuates A.P. 60—

Ut silvae foliis pronos mutantur in annos,
Prima cadunt ita verborum, vetus interit
aetas,
Et iuvenum ritu florent modo nata vigent-
que.

Thus an extremely minute change even for the modern reader—no change at all in the tradition of the MSS.—restores coherence to a passage which has puzzled the commentators from Bentley down, while there is nothing either in the construction thus

emerging or in the rhythm which is not conformable to the manner and practice of Horace.

Mr. Wickham has certainly produced a handsome and useful edition of the *Satires* and *Epistles* of Horace: and, if we cannot say that he has contributed much to the knowledge of Horace or of Latin, perhaps that is because the field has been so recently and so thoroughly gleaned.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

RAWLINS' AND INGE'S *ETON LATIN GRAMMAR*.

The Eton Latin Grammar, for use in the higher forms. Second Edition, by F. H. RAWLINS and W. R. INGE (John Murray, London, 1890).

THIS book, which has now reached a second edition, is intended for those who have already mastered the rudiments of Latin. 'Our object has been to explain the facts already learnt, and at the same time to add to the stock of knowledge already acquired and to carry the learner upward to the higher scholarship' (preface by the authors). This programme is carried out by an elaborate treatment of Latin accidence on a philological basis, and a syntax of average scope. Obligations are acknowledged to King and Cookson's *Sounds and Inflections*, Henry's *Grammaire Comparée*, Brugmann's *Comparative Grammar*, and Schweizer-Sidler's *Latin Grammar*, second edition. The present edition is said to have been 'thoroughly revised,' and the Headmaster of Eton claims in an introductory notice that it is suitable not only for school use but also for students and scholars generally.

A glance at its contents suggests a number of questions of grave moment to the cause of classical education, which however it is impossible to discuss adequately within the limits of a review.

(1) Is grammar a means or an end in school study? Some teachers are using all their efforts to hasten the day when the pupil leaves off mumbling the dry bones of Accidence and commences reading the literature. They attempt to limit the amount of grammar to be learnt to what is really essential, and to present that limited amount in the most perspicuous and digestible form. The facts of grammar may be divided into three classes: (a) those necessary for reading a

language, a surprisingly small quantity; (b) those necessary for writing or speaking a language, a moderate quantity; (c) those necessary for answering grammar papers, an indefinitely large quantity, which however may be indefinitely reduced in proportion as examiners become more enlightened. At Eton it would seem that views of this kind find no favour. The fifth form boy, who ought to have mastered the essentials of accidence, is confronted with a grammar, in which he makes the acquaintance of 'the special forms used in Comedy and those in vogue in the silver age,' not to mention a liberal selection from inscriptions. Are the true ends of classical study furthered by a school grammar which gives as endings of the nominative plural of the 2nd declension *-i, -is, -ēs, -eis* (pp. 34, 37), and of the genitive singular of the 5th declension *-ēi, -ēi, -ēi, -ēi, -ēi, -ēs* (p. 31)?

(2) If two grammars are to be used in a school, ought there not to be some organic connexion between them? Would it not have been wise to make the advanced course strictly supplementary to the elementary, and to treat the knowledge acquired in the latter as a point of departure? Had this been done the authors would have lent powerful aid to the cause of organization and concentration in school work—surely one of the questions of the day. They have preferred to write an independent book. The whole matter of accidence has been thrown into the philological crucible, to emerge in a new and more formidable shape. Syntax is treated *ab initio*, the simplest definitions and rules being repeated.

(3) Is the attempt to initiate the pupil into the mysteries of scientific philology consistent with a simple and practical treatment of the facts of accidence? Take an

example from the treatment of the 3rd declension in the *Eton Grammar*. Which words of this declension form the genitive plural in *-ium*? The answer given is 'those which have *i*-stems.' Which words have *i*-stems? The oracle replies 'The chief test of differentiation of *i*-stems and consonant stems is that the former have gen. plur. in *-ium*, the latter in *-um*' (pp. 51 and 54). I have observed this circle in reasoning in other books which attempt to base accidence on philology. Has it never occurred to the authors that they are offering for bread a stone? This criticism does not apply to such a book as Schweizer-Sidler's *Grammar* (2nd ed.), which is avowedly for the use of the university student, and therefore omits all paradigms.

(4) Is it not both desirable and possible in a grammar to use terms consistently, and to observe the laws of logical classification? The authors would seem to belong to a class of teachers—that such a class really exists must be inferred from the defences offered by them in reply to their critics—who regard these as points of little importance or as savouring of the pedantry of the training college. Such teachers deprecate your taking them too seriously. But surely precision of language may be a valuable instrument of teaching. To use terms at random is to convert them into 'mere sound and fury signifying nothing.' To disregard logic in classification is not merely to sacrifice a powerful lever, but also to accustom pupils to vicious habits of thought. Let the reader examine the use of the terms 'substantive' and 'pronoun' on pp. 94, 212, 213, and say whether the statements made are the more lucid for being illogical. What is gained by such a cross-division as is involved in classifying sentences on p. 214 into (i.) affirmative (ii.) negative (iii.) interrogative? As though a sentence might not be both negative and interrogative (*Nonne venit?*). On p. 216 adverbial sentences (clauses?) are classified (with the omission of *purpose* and the treatment of *result* and *consequence* as two separate kinds¹): but this classification is not maintained in the subsequent discussion; see p. 317, where *cause* is ranged under *attendant circumstances*. On p. 259 we read that a substantive in apposition 'denotes the circumstances in which a statement is made.' The italics are mine. Let the definition be tested by one of the instances given: *Cato senex historiam scribere instituit*. 'Case' is nowhere defined; but the Vocative is declared on p. 21 to be

¹ Apparently a misprint: see p. 215 (bottom).

'not, strictly speaking, a case.' On p. 23 we hear about 'Names essentially masculine': the authors mean 'Names of males.' With similar confusion of gender and sex the *Elementary Grammar* speaks of 'the male gender.'

(5) What is the true place of memory work in teaching, and how far should technical aids to memory be given in a grammar? The authors of the *Elementary Grammar* say that their book is to be 'learnt by heart' (302 pp.); yet both grammars have abandoned gender rimes and similar memorial ruses. I do not feel at all sure that the latter innovation is sound: where a certain body of matter which rests on no rational principle has to be mastered and carried in the memory, *memoria technica* seems distinctly in place. That a whole grammar should be learnt by heart can hardly be meant seriously.

To what extent this book will serve the cause of sound learning at Eton, *viderint Etonenses*. As a book for scholars and students generally, I fear it will prove disappointing. Perhaps the authors ought to be judged leniently. To give a just idea of the leading features of early Latin accidence and syntax, avoiding sins of omission and sins of commission, would have taxed the resources of the first Plautine scholar in Europe. Only one who has examined the facts at first hand can know when he is on safe ground—when he is dealing with real differences of usage and when with mere blunders of the MSS.² Only such a one can know what *not*

² To discuss the points of Plautine criticism involved in this book would lead me too far. But I will quote two instances of the sort of thing that I mean. On p. 37 the authors say 'Plautus wrote *hisce oculis* (Mil. 373) and perhaps *illisce* (Most. 510); Terence has *hisce* (Eun. 269).' The statement occurs under the heading Nominative Plural (of the 2nd declension of nouns). Let the authors examine the latest editions of the *Miles*, by Lorenz (1886) and Goetz (1890), and they will find *oculi*. The reading is uncertain. And where are *Amph.* 974, *Capt. Prol.* 35, *Mil.* 1334, *Pers.* 856, *Rud.* 294, *Trin.* 877 (examples of *hisce*)? Why 'perhaps *illisce*'? If the authors think *Most.* 510 doubtful, why do they not quote *Most.* 935? Parenthetically be it said that examples of *hisce* and *illisce* are here out of place; they should have come on p. 102 (pronouns).—On p. 56 we read, under the heading Ablative Singular (of the 3rd declension) '*ē* appears in *forte*, *morte*, *parte*, *pubē*, all in Plautus.' Do the authors really feel confident that we ought not to read with some scholars *-i*? Not one of these ablatives in *-ē* is recognized by Georges in his *Lexicon der lateinischen Wortformen*: each of them rests upon a single passage of Plautus. *Pubē* is not an ablative at all, but a dative in its passage (*Pseud.* 126). Just above they quote *sine dolei* as Plautine; there is no evidence for this at all (see the MSS. in *Trin.* 714). The whole statement is borrowed wholesale from Bücheler's *Grundriss der lat. Declination*, and without

to say, which in grammar, as in poetry, is half the battle. The writing of a grammar is an art involving a delicate sense of scale and proportion.

The Headmaster of one of our leading Public Schools once said to me, 'What need is there of a new Grammar? I suppose it will give the perfect of *mones* as *monui*.' The *Eton Grammar* is a curious commentary upon this somewhat cynical remark. I have noted a number of points in which it is more or less out of touch with accepted views or with the evidence on which such views ought to be based: but I have space for only two. From the ill-arranged statements on pp. 56, 57 and 71 about the forms of the abl. sing. of the 3rd declension one gathers that adjectives 'whose stems end in *-nti*' form the abl. generally in *-ē*, occasionally in *-ī*: *ingenti* is given as an exception, together with present participles when used as adjectives. (In the *Elementary Grammar* p. 24 we find in the paradigm *ingenti* or *ingente*, and a statement that the present participle is declined 'in the same way.') If so we ought to write *elegante sermone*, *insolente alacritate*, *recente adventu*, etc. But the instances quoted by Neue (second edition, pp. 90—95) show that in these and similar cases the evidence is all in favour of the abl. in *-ī*. On p. 75 we are told that *sal* is generally neuter when it means 'salt,' always masculine when it means 'wit.' This is a strange way of 'adding to the stock of knowledge already acquired.' The dictionary shows that the *Elementary Eton Grammar* was right in giving *sal* and *sol* as masculine: this is the universal gender in Plautus, Cicero, Sallust, Catullus, Horace, Pliny, in both the literal and the metaphorical sense; *sal* neuter is found only in Lucr. iv. 1162 and in a few fragments of authors interesting only to the specialist (Fabius Pictor, Afranius, Varro, etc.), in one at least of which it is used in the metaphorical sense. On p. 25 we find the quantity *salūbris*; but this is perhaps a misprint, as the correct quantity is given elsewhere.

The Syntax, as a whole, is a much better piece of work than the Accidence. It shows in several places a laudable effort to improve upon current doctrine and signs of independent research are not wanting.¹

observing his significant remark that the difference between *i* and *e* in the MSS. is a comparatively unimportant fact, as the question is one simply of the length or shortness of the vowel.

¹ On p. 309 two new instances are quoted for *ne* with the present subjunctive in a prohibition addressed to a particular person: Martial ix. 61. 20, Tibullus ii. 6. 28.

The treatment of the Supines as Verbal Nouns (p. 266 f.) is good, particularly the note on the Future Infinitive Passive. Conditional Sentences are better classified than in the Public School Primer, the main results of the discussion in the *Classical Review* i. p. 124 f. having apparently been utilized.² I sympathize with the attempt which has been made on p. 326 to distinguish sentences like *Accusavit Socratem quod inventum corrumperet* and *Rogo quod eas* from sentences containing *Oratio Obliqua* proper.³ But the new term introduced for the former—'Described Speech'—can hardly be regarded as a happy one. 'Contained Speech' would be better: but why 'Speech' at all? Are not such clauses best described simply as Object and Subject Clauses (Noun Clauses)?—The verb in the 'Described Question,' i.e. Dependent Question, is said to be 'naturally Subjunctive' (p. 334). Why 'naturally'? English, like Old Latin, habitually uses the Indicative: I am afraid boys who are beyond the stage of writing the Indic. in Latin are apt to put in the Accus. with Infin. Their teachers are perfectly within their rights in telling them that classical Latin, as a matter of fact, demands the Subjunctive; but the word 'naturally' will not enlighten them. Sequence of Tenses (p. 337) is rightly denied in Consecutive Clauses, though this is not consistent with the *Elementary Grammar*, p. 152; but there is no mention under this head of sequence in Dependent Questions or in Noun Clauses dependent on expressions like *accidit*, *factum est*, etc. If, as the pupil would gather from p. 336, sequence is confined to Final Clauses, then there is no need to speak of 'sequence' at all; for it

² I object however (i.) to saying that two Pluperf. Indicatives are 'unintelligible'; a sentence like *si peccaverat, praemium non meruerat* is quite possible, though no instance has been quoted: (ii.) to representing the protasis of *si hic sis, aliter sentias* as 'rhetorically possible'; the old Latin *sis* here is precisely = *esses*: (iii.) to calling the Subjunctive in *o mihi praeteritos referat* etc. 'hypothetical'; this is quite inconsistent with pp. 308, 311, 316: (iv.) to speaking of cases like *si fractus illabatur orbis impavidum ferient ruinae* as cases of substitution of an Indic. for a Subj. in the apodosis: I think the Indic. is here quite normal, as in Engl. 'Should the welkin crack and fall upon him, the ruins will strike him undismayed': cf. my note on Plautus, Rudens 1021.

³ The rules for *Oratio Obliqua* on p. 331 contain a slip, five times repeated: *dicat si peccet dolitum esse*, without *se* (subject of Infin.). On pp. 332 f. the rules for conditional sentences in dependence are in part antiquated by the researches of Stegmann: the ordinary way of expressing sentences like *si peccaret doleret* and *si peccavisset culpatus esset* (Passive) in dependence on an expression like *factum est ut* is to leave the Subjunctive unchanged in both clauses.

is quite sufficient to say that the present subjunctive in Final Clauses expresses a *present purpose*, the imperf. subjunctive a *past purpose*. The only two cases which experience in teaching Latin prose shows to be difficulties are ignored on pp. 336 f.; they are (i.) cases like *nescio quot fuerint* (not *essent*), (ii.) cases like *accidit ut una nocte omnes Hermae deicerentur* (not *deiecti sint*); the rule given under another heading (p. 327) is directly misleading.—Appendix IV (p. 207) recognizes an Aorist Subjunctive, as well as a Future Perf. Subj.; this will be regarded as an improvement by some teachers; but are Livy 44. 22 and Plaut. Rud. 730 good examples of the Future Perf. Subj.? In the latter *noveris* = *noturus sis*; cf. line 756 and Pseud. 464, where the pres. subj. is used in the same sense: do the writers mean to call *noturus sis* a Fut. Perf. Subj.? It is strange that in the Accidence (p. 130) *amaturus esse* is

called 'Future and Fut. Perf. Infin.'—Appendix VI (p. 210) contains a good list of Past (Perfect? cf. p. 140) Participles of Deponent Verbs with passive sense, on which a good deal of trouble has evidently been expended.¹

In conclusion I would say that the Syntax, if carefully revised in the next edition, may become a very serviceable treatise. If I may venture to add another hint to those given above, I would ask the authors to consider firstly whether the remarks on Plautine syntax should not be either abolished or else rendered more complete; and secondly whether they have not laid too much stress upon the 'pedigrees' of the Cases.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

¹ Should not *comitatus* (from the parallel Active form *comito*) have been included, if *auguratus* (from *auguro*) is admitted?

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE 'ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ.

THE following list includes all the emendations which have been received by the Editors between Feb. 21 and March 21, excepting those which were already anticipated in the last number. Each emendation is assigned to its author by his initials as under:—

F. Blass* (B.), E. H. Brooks (EHB.), J. B. Bury† (JBB.), S. H. Butcher (SHB.), R. Ellis (E.), H. van Herwerden‡ (H.) (who promises an edition shortly), G. F. Hill (GFH.), G. E. Marindin (GEM.), J. B. Mayor (JBM.), W. R. Paton (WRP.), A. Platt (AP.), H. Richards (HR.), W. G. Rutherford (R.), J. A. Stewart (St.), R. Y. Tyrrell (T.), L. Whibley (LW.).

Mr. Kenyon has kindly compared the emendations with the papyrus and added a note (signed K.) where the former are not inconsistent with the MS. reading.

P. 2, l. 6. *τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις*. Read *τοῖς τε* JBM. B., H. (or *καὶ τοῖς*) HR., [*τοῖς τε* MS., I think. K.]

P. 3, l. 2. *ἐπὶ ταύτης τῆς μισθώσεως*

* In *Lit. Centralblatt* for Feb. 28.

† Partly or wholly in *Academy* for Feb. 28, MS., I think. K.]

‡ In *Berl. philol. Wochenschrift* for March 14.

εἰργάζοντο. Read perhaps *ὑπέρ* or *περι* M., *ἀπό* J., B. [I think the MS. has the accusative (in abbreviated form) *ταύτην*) *τ(ὴν) μίσθωσιν*. K.]

P. 3, l. 6. Should not *δεδανεισμένοι* be substituted for *δεδεμένοι* here and on p. 13, l. 7? The supplement *τοῖς δανείσασιν* in the former passage then requires alteration. WRP. For *καὶ δεδεμένοι* read perhaps *καὶ ὑπεύθυνοι*. The phrase *ὑπεύθυνος τόκων* occurs in an inscription cited by Rost and Palmer. JBM.

P. 3, l. 9. [*ἀρχῶν μὴ μετέχουσιν*. Read *τῆς γῆς μὴ μετέχουσιν*. B., HR.

P. 4, l. 2. *βασίλειός τε καὶ πολέμαρχος*. Has the editor assured himself that the writer of this treatise ever uses *τε καὶ* in juxtaposition? R.

P. 5, l. 3. *διὰ τοῦ γίγνεσθαι*. Read *τό*. Cf. 26, 6, &c. HR., B. [Possible. K.]

P. 5, l. 4. *πολεμικά* for *πολέμια*. B., HR.

P. 6, l. 4. *ἐπὶ Ἀκάστον [τῆς πόλεως ἀρξέειν]*. Would not [*βασιλέως ἀρξέειν*] be a better supplement? AP.

P. 6, l. 6. *παρὰχωρησάντων τῶν Κοδ[ριδῶν] ... τῷ ἀρχοντι δωρεῶν**. The meaning is that the Kodrids resigned their prerogatives in favour of the archon. Read perhaps *τῶν γεροντων*. JBB. May not *δωρεῶν* have much the same force? Cf. Dem. 157, 6 *τὰς πολιτικὰς δωρεάς*, explained by Reiske to mean

immunitates, jus epulandi in Prytaneo, &c.
JBM.

P. 6, l. 7. ὑποτέρως ποτ' ἔχει for ποτ. **B.**
P. 6, l. 9. πατρίων? on account of ἐπιθέ-
τοις; cf. cap. 57 ff. **W.** [τὸ μηδὲν τῶν
πατρίων. **B.** [I think this is right: the
μη seems discernible. **K.**]

P. 6, l. 11. ἀλλὰ[τὰ νεώτερα]. **B.**

P. 6, l. 16. Read ἐγένετο πλὴν ἢ (or πλὴν
εἰ) ἐνιαύσιος. **R.**

P. 6, l. 17. If [οὔτοι] refers to the βα-
σιλείς, πολέμαρχος, and ἄρχων, then we should
read προέχουσι τῶν ἄλλων, and regard from
'θεσμοθέται δὲ πολλοῖς' to 'ἐνιαύσιος' as
either misplaced or parenthetical. If ἀλλήλων
is read in l. 18 we must change προέχουσι
to δέχουσι. **R.**

P. 6, l. ult. ἦσαν δ' οὐχ ἅμα πάντες οἱ
ἐνθάδε ἄρχοντες. This could not express the
fact that the archons had different offices or
courts. Now Mr. Kenyon's ἔκρησαν was
probably a *vox propria* for the archons' office
or court. Cp. ἡδὲ ἐσπέρως οὐσης καὶ σκότους
ἔρχεται Μειδίας οὔτοσι πρὸς τὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων
οἶκμα [office] καὶ καταλαμβάνει τοὺς ἀρχοντας
ἐξιώντας (Dem. Meid. 542). *Domus* is used
in the same sense in Juv. xiii. 160. The
imperf. is not so suitable as the aorist in a
general statement about the past. **T.**

P. 11, l. 1. There is no need to alter
ἐλάττω. What we want is τὰς δ' ἄλλας
ἀρχὰς <τὰς> ἐλάττω. The article is omitted
repeatedly in this text. **HR., B., W.**

P. 11, l. 3. οὐκ ἐλάττων ἢ ἑκατὸν μῶν
ἐλευθέρων. As the note remarks, 100 seems
a very improbable number, when for the
superior office it is only 10. This may be
obviated, and the sentence made to corre-
spond with the preceding sentence by reading
οὐκ ἐλάττων ἑκαστον ἢ μῶν ἐλευθέρων (i.e.
8 minae). The alteration might have arisen
from a misunderstanding of the numeral
letter. **GEM.**

P. 11. στρατηγὸς δὲ καὶ ἱππάρχος οὐσίαν
ἀποφαίνοντας οὐκ ἐλάττων ἢ ἑκατὸν μῶν ἐλευ-
θέρων (*lege* ἐλευθέρων) καὶ παῖδας ἐκ γαμετῆς
γυναικὸς γνησίους ὑπὲρ δέκα ἔτη γεγονότας· τοί-
τους δὲ δεῖν εἶναι τοὺς πρυτάνεις καὶ τοὺς
στρατηγὸς καὶ τοὺς ἱππάρχους τοῦ γένους με-
χρὶ εὐθυνῶν . . . The words δεῖν εἶναι give no
sense, and a note tells us that the original
word began with δι. We expect some ex-
planation in regard to the provision that
strategoi and hipparchoi must have sons of
ten years or over. The sons of course were
to be pledges for the conduct of the fathers;
and consequently some official supervision
must have been exercised over them. We
must suppose, for example, that the son of a
strategos would not be allowed to leave

Athens during his father's year of office.
Read, then, τοὺς δὲ δι[ατηρεῖν] τοὺς πρυτάν-
εις καὶ τοὺς στρατηγὸς καὶ τοὺς ἱππάρχους *τοῦ
γένους* μέχρι εὐθυνῶν. A board, consisting of
the Prytaneis, the Strategoi, and the Hip-
parchoi, was to watch closely the sons of the
officers in question, τοὺς referring to γνησί-
ους παῖδας. Or perhaps we should punctuate
after πρυτάνεις; in that case the duty de-
volved on the Prytaneis alone. **JBB.** τοὺς
δὲ δεῖν εἶναι τοὺς πρυτάνεις καὶ τοὺς στρατη-
γὸς καὶ τοὺς ἱππάρχους τοῦ γένους μέχρι εὐθυνῶν
. . . τὰς δ' ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τέλους δεχομένους οὔπερ
οἱ στρατηγοὶ καὶ οἱ ἱππάρχου. Here, as in
many other places, words have got into the
wrong place. I would read τοὺς δὲ δεῖν
κρατεῖν τοὺς δεχομένους (τοὺς στρατηγὸς
καὶ τοὺς ἱππάρχους) τοῦ γένους μέχρι εὐθυνῶν
εὐθύνοντας δ' ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τέλους πρυτάνεις
οὔπερ οἱ στρατηγοὶ καὶ οἱ ἱππάρχου. Compare
p. 140, l. 11—κρατεῖν μέχρι ἀρχῆς τέλους.
The writer uses γερῶν, p. 144, l. 2. **T.**

Read τοὺς δὲ διαφυλάττειν τοὺς πρυτάνεις,
καὶ τοὺς στρατηγὸς καὶ τοὺς ἱππάρχους
τοὺς ἔτους μέχρι εὐθυνῶν, ἐγγνητὰς δ' ἐκ τοῦ
αὐτοῦ τέλους [μὴ] παρασχομένους κ.τ.λ. The
prytanes are to keep in custody the children
of the *strategi* and *hipparchi*, and the *strategi*
and *hipparchi* themselves during the period
which elapses between their retirement from
office and their audit, unless they give four
sureties, &c. **WRP.** [But is there the
slightest hint of such a regulation existing
at Athens?]

P. 13, l. 7. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς σώμασιν ἦσαν δεδε-
μένοι. There would seem to be no parallel
anywhere for this figurative use of δεδεμένοι.
The verb is only used of actual bonds or im-
prisonment. Is it possible that we ought to
read δεδανεισμένοι? Cf. δανείζειν ἐπὶ τοῖς
σώμασιν, p. 15, l. 14, and perhaps p. 3, l. 6,
where, if I am right, we must not insert
δεδεμένοι. **HR.**

P. 14, 5. It has occurred to me with
regard to the words καὶ γὰρ ἐπήλανε on p.
14 of Mr. Kenyon's *Aristotle on the Athen-
ian Constitution*, that they may be the
beginning of a third verse (expressing the
strife between the parties), and that the
rest has fallen out. Perhaps they were
inserted by some one who knew how the
lines continued.

If they are part of the text, perhaps
ΕΠΗΜΥΝΕΝ might be suggested, (i.e. he
came to the assistance of the country).
ΕΚΠΡΑΥΝΕΙ also occurred to me, though
it has no classical authority. **GPH.**

P. 14, l. 5. The words misrepresented by
the unmeaning καὶ γὰρ ἐπήλανε seem to be

part of Solon's poem, and to describe the distracted state of Athens, perhaps *καὶ γὰρ ἐτ' ἡλαίνει* ('is distracted'). **T.** [But do we not want the *καὶ γὰρ* to introduce *πρὸς ἑκατέρους ὑπὲρ ἑκατέρων μάχεται*?]

P. 15, l. 7. Perhaps for *ἄρτια* read *ἄρθμα*. Cp. Theog. 1312 *ἄρθμος ἡδὲ φίλος*. **T.**

P. 16, l. 6. For *[μετὰ δὲ] οὐ πολὺ*, read *ὕστερον δὲ* (or *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα*) *οὐ πολὺ*, 'not long afterwards.' **T.**

P. 16, l. 12. For *[νόμ]ους* read *ἐτέρους*. **B.**

P. 16, l. 17. *μετεκρούσαστο* may be right. The idea of a balance underlies the word, as in *παρκαρούεσθαι*; and 'he shifted the balance of affairs' would be a not unnatural way of saying 'he changed the face of politics.' **T.** I previously suggested *κατεπαύσαστο*, thinking the middle voice might be due to Solon. I think now the right reading is *ὅτι δὲ... νοσοῦντα κατέπανσε, το<ύτου> καὶ ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασιν αὐτὸς μέμνηται. μέμνηται* 'desiderates' *τούτου*. **HR.**

P. 17, last line. <τὰ> *τιμήματα*. **B.**

P. 20, l. 2. *ἐφ' ἣ* instead of *ἐφ' ᾧ*. **B.** [corrected in 2nd ed.]

P. 20, l. 3. It is impossible that an inscription should consist of two pentameters. Read

ἵππον Διφίλον Ἀνθεμίον ἀνέθηκε θεοῖσι; and, in the next lines, read *ἐπιμαρτυρῶν* for *ἐκμαρτυρῶν*. **T.** For *ἐκμαρτυρῶν* read *ἐκ τῶν ἀρστερῶν*. **B.** I should prefer to read *Διφίλον Ἀνθεμίον τήνδ' εἰκόν' ἔθηκε θεοῖσι* as more metrical, nearer to the MS. and more easily leading to the existing corruption. The letters *ονεθηκε* naturally suggested the familiar *ἀνέθηκε*, and later scribes would drop the unmeaning *εικ* and change the line to a pentameter by reading *θεοῖσι*. **JBM., HR.** Nor do I see the objection to *ἐκμαρτυρῶν*, of which the first meaning in Stephanus is *palam testificor*, Aesch. *Eum.* 461 *λοῦτρων ἐξεμαρτύρει φόνον*, and Aeschin. xv. 19 *εἰς πολλοὺς ἐκμαρτυρήσας* being cited as examples. Even the technical sense (thus defined in *Etym. Mag.* *ἐκμαρτυρία γε γενομένη ἀναγιγνώσκεται ὅταν τις ἢ τελευταίῃ ἢ ὑπερόριος γένηται*) would be quite appropriate here, cf. Schoemann on Isaeus, iii. 77, 'The horse standing by his master's side in the bas-relief may be cited to prove that the term *ἵππας* signified τὸ *ἵπποτροφεῖν δύνασθαι*' (p. 19). If any change is needed I should prefer to put *ὥς* before *ἐκμαρτυρῶν*, as Mr. A. S. Murray has suggested to me, 'stands by as though proclaiming,' rather than to read *σημαίνουσιν*. For the participial construction cf. Soph. *Ant.* 995, and Antiphon, 115, 21, *μηνύει ὁ θάνατος αὐτὸν ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς ἀποθανόντα*. **JBM.**

P. 21, l. 4. For *προκρίνει* read *προούκρινε*. **B.** (or *προκρίνοι*) **HR.**

P. 23, l. 6. For *[ἦν δὲ τῶν]* read *ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν*. **B.**

P. 24, ll. 2, 3. *ἐν τοῖς νόμοις τοῖς Σόλωνος οἷς οὐκέτι χρώνται* (οἶον *[εἰκὸς] γέγραπται*). For *οἶον εἰκὸς* I would suggest *οἱ νῦν*. **St., HR.**

P. 24, l. 9. *τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ μέγιστα τῶν πολιτῶν διετῆρει*. Read *τῶν πολιτικῶν*. **HR.**

P. 24, l. 10. For *[τοῦ]* read *καὶ*, as in p. 9, l. 2. **B.**

P. 25, l. 1. For *τὴν πρόφασιν* [ν τοῦ κολάζ-] *εσθαι*, read *τὴν πρόφασιν τοῦ ἐκτίνεσθαι*. **T.** Read *εὐθύνεσθαι*. **B.**

P. 26, l. 8. *ἀνάγκ[η ἢ ν]* read *ἀνάγκη πολλὰς*. **B.**

P. 27, l. 1. *κύριος* seems to me impossible. Perhaps for *ἔχῃ* [*ὁ δῆμος κ*] *ύριος* we should read *ἔχῃ τὰ δικαστήρια*. **GEM.**

P. 27, l. 7. *τὴν τῶν χρεῶν*. **HR., B.** (with **R** in *C. R.*, p. 91.)

P. 27, l. 11. *Οἱ μὲν*. **B.**

P. 27, l. 12. *δραχμαῖς*. **B.**

P. 27, l. ult. For *τ[ρ]εῖς καὶ ἐξήκοντα*, read, perhaps, *ὡς καθ' ἐξ*. The abbreviated symbols for *καὶ* and *κατὰ* are very much alike. **T.** But *καί* is not abbreviated here. **K.**

P. 28, l. 7. For *ἐλογίσαστο*, read *ἐσοφίσαστο*. **B.**

P. 28, l. 14. *καὶ τὰς στάσεις ἀμφοτέρας μεταθέσθαι*. The facsimile seems to point to a somewhat longer word than *μεταθέσθαι*, which can hardly be right. Perhaps *μεταμέλεσθαι*. Both parties repented of having accepted Solon as reformer. **JBB.** The writing straggles a little, but every letter of *μεταθέσθαι* is traceable. **K.**

P. 28, l. 17. For *ἥς [μέντοι] παραλλάξ[ας δόξης]* read *ἡ συμκρὸν παραλλάξεν· ὁ δὲ* (*παρ.* being transitive, *Top.* iii. 5, p. 119a, 15). **B.**

P. 30, l. 5.

ἃ μὲν γὰρ εἶπα σὺν θεοῖσιν ἦνυσσ.

[*ἄλλα δ' αὖ μ[ά]την ἔερδ[ον]*, οὐδέ μοι τυραννίδος

ἀνδάνει βία τι [ῥέξ]εν οὐδὲ πιείρας χθονὸς πατρίδος κακοῖσιν ἐσθλοῖς ἰσομοιρίαν ἔχειν. The contrast is between the things which Solon did and the things (*ἄλλα*) which he did not do, but which the demos on the one hand, and the aristocracy on the other, wanted him to do. Therefore read

ἄλλα δ' οὐ μάτην ἔερδον. **JBB., B.**

Would it not make better sense to read *τὰλλα δ' οὐ μάτην* 'the rest of my actions (as distinguished from the mere fulfilment of promises) were reasonable'? **JBM.**

[Bergk gives *αὖ* in the quotation from Aristides, but apparently the MSS. of the latter have *οὐ*. **K.**]

P. 30, l. 7. Read ἀνδάνει βία τι κινεῖν.
JBB. ἥνδανεν. HR. ἄνδανεν. B.

P. 30, l. 12. As Mr. Kenyon informs me that the MS. may be read νηγαγον at the end of this line, it is clear we should read

ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν μὲν εἵνεκα ξυνήγαγον
δῆμον.

How to fill up the rest I cannot guess satisfactorily. The meaning should be 'On the one hand I gathered together the people, and on the other refrained from making myself tyrant.' Compare *Politics* iii. 14 ἡ δὲ διὰ τὸ συναγαγεῖν [τὸ πλῆθος] . . . ἐγένοντο βασιλεῖς ἐκόντων. AP. ἀξονήλατον cannot be satisfactorily explained. Some word meaning 'enslaved' would suit the δουλεπόντων πρότερον above. There may have been a word ζυγήλατον or ζυγήλατον, and we might read οἵνεκα ζυγήλατον. Ζυγηφόρον, which does exist, is further from the text. GEM. I conjecture 'Εγὼ δὲ τοῦτων εἵνεκ' ἀξονήλατον | δῆμον τίων (?) τῶν πρὶν τυχῶν ἐπαυσάριν (νῦν ?) or ἐλυσάμην (ἐρυσάμην ?). ἐπαυσάμην is certainly wrong. B. Perhaps ἀξονηλάτουν—τί—τυχεῖν. The Berlin papyrus has -σάμαν, what precedes being illegible. B. Can there be an allusion to the revolving ἀξονες on which the Laws of Solon were engraved? If so, ἀξονηλατῶν (from ἀξονηλατέω) would be a poetical synonym for νομοθετῶν, and would be taken with ἐπαυσάμην; or perhaps we should read οἵνεκα ξενήλατον = 'treated like a stranger and banished.' See l. 8 of this fragment. T.

P. 30, l. ult. For τυχῶν, read τυχεῖν. T. [Possible. K.]

P. 31, l. 8. Read χρεοῦς, comparing © 57. B.

P. 31, last line. The MS. gives

εἰ γὰρ ἤθελον
αὐτοῖς ἐναντιο[ισι]ν ἥνδανεν τότε
αὐθις δε αὐτοῖσιν οὐτεραι φρασάιατο
πολλὸν ἀν ἀνδρῶν ἡδ' ἐχρησθη πόλις.

In 32 the MSS. of Aristides, who quotes the same passage, give αὐ τοῖς for αὐτοῖς: in 33 αὐθις δ' αὐ τοῖσιν ἀτέροις absurdly. The letters of the papyrus point to αὐθις δ' αὐ τοῖσι θῆτέρα or θάτέρα. For φρασάιατο the MSS. of Aristides give δρᾶσαι διά. It seems probable that in -ατο of the papyrus the first two letters are a corruption of ΔΙ (into ΑΤ), and that the whole verse ran originally thus:

αὐθις δ' αὐ τοῖσι θάτέρα δρᾶσαι δίχα.

δίχα, Ahrens and O. Schneider. 'Had I been

willing to carry out separately what at the time was the wish of the opposite party, and again what pleased those on the other side.' E.

P. 32, ll. 1, 2. τότε may be defended by p. 30, l. 3. Is ποεῖν admissible in Ionic verse? δίχα is no gloss but a conjecture of O. Schneider's. AP.

P. 32, l. 2. Probably we should read

αὐθις δ' αὐ τοῖσδ' ἀν ἀτέροι φρασάιατο. T.

P. 32, l. 4. ἀλκὴν ποιεῖμενος seems to be right; compare Sophocles *O. C.* 459. AP.

P. 32, l. 6. For αὐ[τοῦ] read αὐτῶν. B.

P. 33, l. 5. καὶ πάλιν εἶτι πέμπτω *τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν ἀρχαίαν* ἐποίησαν. The editor's suggestion, διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἐποίησαν, gives the required sense, but does not explain the corruption. Read τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν ἀναρχίας. The omission of one αν caused the corruption. ἀναρχία is the negative of ἀρχή, 'archonship' (cf. Xenophon, *Hell.* ii. 3, 1). JBB. Surely the evidence points rather to ἡ αὐτὴ αἰτία ἀναρχίαν ἐποίησεν (HAYTHAITIDAANAPXIANEPOIH-CEN)? R. The emendation already proposed, διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν ἀναρχίαν ἐποίησαν, is neat, if the phrase can be maintained, but it appears to me to be rightly questioned. τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν ἀναρχίας ἐποίησαντο occurred to me, but I am inclined rather to propose διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν ἀναρχοὶ ἦσαν. The first corruption, whence the rest followed, may have been the repetition of ἀναρχοί, so that αὐτῶν ἀναρχοῖ ἀναρχοῖσιν was produced. GEM. For αἰτίαν ἀρχαίαν read εἶτι ἀναρχίαν. B.

P. 36, l. 4. οἱ τὴν ὀλιγαρχίαν ἐξήλθον. Perhaps ἐξήλθον here and on p. 93, l. 6. JBB.

P. 36, l. 6. προσεκεκόσμητο δὲ τοῖτοῖς οἱ τε ἀ[φ]ηρημένοι τὰ χρέα κ.τ.λ. Read προσενέμνητο. The word is often used of attaching oneself to a certain party or person. Cp. Dem. *Ol.* ii. 29 οἱ δ' ἄλλοι προσενέμνησθε οἱ μὲν ὡς τοῦτους, οἱ δὲ ὡς ἐκείνους, Dem. (?) *Ep.* iii. 2 τότε ταῖς τοῦ δήμου προαιρέσεσι προσένεμεν ἑαυτὸν, Dem. (?) *Aristog.* i. 43 οὐ σωφρονοῦσι προσνέμειντες αὐτοὺς τοῖτω. SHB.

P. 36, l. 6. Has δοκιμώτατος εἶναι δοκῶν been inserted from p. 37, l. 1? R.

P. 36, l. 10. κατάπανσιν for κατάστασιν. B., HR., WRP. κατάλυσιν MS. K.

P. 39, l. 1. ἐπέραιναν οὐδέν. B.

P. 41, last line. τότε πρῶτον (cf. 58, 5). B.

P. 42, l. 11. [φωνῇ δ' ἐξεκλησί]ασεν μικρόν.

The restoration is certainly wrong. The alternative expressions are μικρόν or φωνῇ μικρᾷ, and the verb should be ἐδημηγόρησε or ἐφώνησε, or something of that kind. Is the α certain? I cannot discover from the facsimile. **JBB.** Read [ἐπίτηδες δ' ἐφώνη]σε μικρόν. The facsimile at least shows no sign of a in -ασεν. It may be observed that Polyaeus does not seem to have had before him the same text of the *Const. of Athens*. **T.** [φωνῶν δ' ἐξεκλησι]ασεν μικρόν for φωνῇ. **W.** [I don't think there is much doubt about the α. **K.**]

P. 43, l. 12. ὥστε δια[μπε]ρὲς ἐγεωργοῦντο. τοῦτο δ' ἐποίει κ.τ.λ. This adverb and the middle verb are, of course, impossible. The MS. has ἐγεωγρονται. Possibly ὥστε ἰδίου ἀγρούς ἐγεωγρον. καὶ τοῦτο δ' ἐποίει κ.τ.λ. **JBB.** I would suggest ὥστε διετέλουν γεωργούντες, and ἀγροίκοις for ἀ[πο]ροι[s] in the previous line. **St.**

P. 44, l. 11. ἀπεκρίνατο <αὐτὸν> ἀγροῶν. **W.**

P. 44, l. 15. ἐπηρείς ἡσυχίαν. **B.**

P. 44, l. 20. μέγιστον δὲ πάντων ἦν [τῶν ἀρεσκο]μένων. Perhaps τῶν προσαγομένων or προσαγαγομένων, as προσάγεσθαι exactly means *sibi conciliare*. After [τῶν προσαγαγο-]μένων I suppose τὸν δῆμον to have fallen out of the archetype before τὸ δημοτικόν. **T.**

P. 44, last line. ὁ δὲ προσκαλεσάμενος φοβηθεὶς ἔλιπεν. Read ἐξέλιπεν. Cf. 12, 4 ἐκλείπει [τὴν σύν]οδον: Deinarchus, 3, 98 τοῦ νῦν ἐκλειοιπότης τὴν κρίσιν: Plat. *Laues*, xii. 943 Α ἐν δὲ τις ἐκλείπει τινὶ κάκῃ μὴ στρατηγῶν ἀφάντων. **HR.**

P. 44, last line. ἔμεινε [τυραννῶν. Rather ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ on account of the following ἐκπέσει . . . ἐπελάμβανε. **W.**, **B.**

P. 45, l. 4. καὶ πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους ἐπεφύκει καλῶς. Read ἀμφοτέρως, viz. τὰς ὁμιλίας καὶ τὰς βοηθείας. **W.**

P. 45, l. 7. καὶ δὴ καὶ ὁ μάλιστα καθ[ήκ]ων πρὸς τῆς τυραννίδος. This is untranslatable. The MS. has πρὸς τ(ὴν) τ(ῆς) τυραννίδος. Perhaps read καθήκων πρὸς προστάτας τ. The law referred both to the tyrant himself and to those who were chiefly instrumental in establishing a tyranny. προστάται (almost 'ringleaders') covers both. For the expression cf. Xenophon, *Hell.* v. 1, 36—προστάται γενομένοι τῆς εἰρήνης. **JBB.** Perhaps καθ[απ-]τόμενος. **WRP.**

P. 45, l. 10 ff. Read perhaps ἐπι<χειροῦντι or -τιθεμένω> τυραννίδι κτέ. Cf. 38. **W.**

P. 45, l. 17. Ληρῶσι<ν οἷ> φάσκοντες? **W.**

P. 46, l. 1. ἦσαν δὲ δύο μὲν ἐκ τῆς γαμετῆς . . . δύο δ' ἐκ τῆς Ἀργείας κ.τ.λ. This would imply that the Argive Timonassa was only a concubine of Pisistratus; but the author knew that she was his wife, for in the next

sentence he tells us so—ἐγγμεν γὰρ κ.τ.λ. The opposition is clearly between the first wife and the second. Read, therefore, ἐκ τῆς πρώτης γαμετῆς (or τῆς γαμετῆς τῆς πρώτης). The corruption (in either case) was due to the homoioteleuton τῆς. **JBB.** τῆς <Ἀττι-κῆς> γαμετῆς. **W.**

P. 46, l. 8. ἐπὶ Παλληνίδι, as in 42, 5. **B.** [ἐπὶ in MS. **K.**]

P. 46, l. 9. ὅθεν καὶ ἡ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀργείους ἐνέστη φιλία καὶ συνεμαχέσαντο χίλιοι τὴν ἐν Παλληνίδι μάχην Πεισιστράτου κομίσαντος. It was pointed out in the last number that κομίσαντος was an unsuitable word to use of Pisistratus himself. It is rightly used of an ally or subordinate, as in Herod. i. 61, speaking of this very expedition, Λύδαμιν προθυμίην πλείστην παρέχεται κομίσας καὶ χρήματα καὶ ἄνδρας. By changing the first three letters of Πεισιστράτου we get the name of one closely connected with Argos and likely to have brought an Argive reinforcement, viz. Hegesistratus, the son of Timonassa, P.'s Argive wife. The only question is whether he was old enough to do this, as he is stated in l. 17 to have been much younger than his brothers. We learn however from Herod. v. 94 that within eight years from this time he was old enough to be placed in charge of Sigeum by his father, and that he successfully defended it against the Mytilenaeans; and in l. 10 we read that P. married Timonassa during his first exile (B.C. 555-551). [The other report, οἱ δὲ κατέχοντα τὴν ἀρχήν, is consistent with the marriage having taken place either before or after.] It would be in accordance with these facts if we assume his age to have been about sixteen when the battle of Pallene was fought; and this would make him some fifteen years younger than Hippias and Hipparchus, who are said (Her. i. 61) to have been young men when P. married the daughter of Megacles in 551 B.C. [I use Mr. Kenyon's dates.] **JBM.** The MS. is a little blurred, but I believe now that the reading is Ἡγησιστράτου. **K.**

P. 46, l. 11. μὲν τῶν. **B.** **HR.**

P. 46 (*ad extrem.*). The editor makes a difficulty about the antecedent of ἀφ' οὗ. Is not οὗ neuter? **JBB.** [There can be little doubt that οὗ is neuter, but the historical difficulty still remains, for we can only explain it to mean that the insolent character of Thettalus was the cause of the misfortunes of his race; and we can hardly understand the following ἐρασθεὶς of any one but Thettalus.] Θετταλὸς—ἔβριστῆς is out of place and perhaps a gloss. **W.**

P. 47, l. 3. ἐνεσῆμαινε τὸ πικρόν. Read ἐνεσῆμαίνετο τὸ π. **HR.**

P. 47, l. 11. κατερχόμενος (descendens ex arce) for μετερχόμενος. **W.**

P. 48, l. 15. ἀλλ' ὁ λεγόμενος λόγος . . . οὐκ ἀληθής ἐστιν. But the MS. has αληθες. Read οὐ τάληθής. **JBB.**

P. 48, l. 16. οὐ γὰρ ἐπεμπον τότε μεθ' ὅπλων for ἐπέμποντο (with **R.**, **WRP.** and **HR.**): against Thuc. VI. 58 μετὰ γὰρ ἀσπίδος καὶ δόρατος εἰώθεσαν τὰς πομπὰς ποιεῖν, which is thus shown to be genuine. So πρὸ τῆς συλλήψεως (48) confirms the reading πρὶν ξυλληφθῆναι, Thuc. I. 21, which was doubted by Cobet, **B.**

P. 49, l. 3. ἐμῖνεν, rather μῆνυν. **W.**

P. 49, l. 5. πείσας αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰππῖαν δοῦναι τὴν δεξιάν. Read αὐτῷ. **JBB.**

P. 50, l. 8. The third line of the *scolion* does not scan. Read ἀγαθοὺς τε καὶ εὐπατριδῶν. **T.**

Bergk has suggested τε χαμ' and τ' ἐτῇ τ', and I have thought of γένει τ'. But it seems much more likely that τε καὶ was an insertion made to fill the place of some quite dissimilar word which fell out. I would read

ἀγαθ<οὺς, καλ>οὺς, εὐπατρίδας. **JBB.**

[The *scolion* is given in the same form by Athenaeus, Suidas, and the Etym. Magn. **K.**]

P. 50, l. 12. There is apparently a lacuna here. The passage perhaps originally stood thus: *ὅθεν [εἰδοκμήσαντες, τὴν Πυθίαν] εὐτρεπίσαντο χρήμασι.* The words in brackets were omitted by a copyist's error, and *εἰτ. χρήμασι* conjecturally altered to *εὐπόρησαν χρημάτων.* **WRP.**

Id. l. 16. εἰς τοῦτ' εὐθέως προὔτρεψε τοὺς Σπαρτιάτας. Read perhaps εἰς τοῦτο δ' ὁ θεὸς προὔτρεψε κ.τ.λ. **JBB.** Is not this too much of a repetition of ἡ Πυθία προέφερεν? If we make a slight change and read καὶ εἰς τοῦθ' ὁ θεὸς προὔτρεψε, we merely touch on it in passing to the more important cause συνεβάλλετο κ.τ.λ. **JBM.** For εὐθέως perhaps εὐθέως, 'conveniently,' 'easily.' There may be a contrast between the comparative facility with which she prevailed on the Spartiates, and the greater difficulty experienced in urging on the other Laconians. **T.** εἰς τοῦθ' ἔως, cf. Schol. Ar. *Lys.* 1153. **B.**

P. 50, l. 18. συνεβάλλετο. συνεβάλετο? **HR.**

P. 52, l. 6. ἡττούμενος, cf. Herod. v. 66. **B.**

P. 53, l. 16. ἐπίστενον ὁ δῆμος τῷ Κλεισθένι. ὁ δῆμος is clearly a gloss. **JBB.** So **R.**

P. 56, l. 1. ἀναγορεύσω. ? προσαγορεύσω. **HR.**

P. 56, l. 7. προσηγόρευσε δὲ τῶν δόμων τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν τόπων, τοὺς δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν κτισάντων οὐ γὰρ ἅπαντες ὑπῆρχον ἐν τοῖς τόποις. The editor suggests that ἅπασι should be read. Palaeographically οὐ γὰρ ἅπαντες <οἱ κτισαντες> ὑπῆρχον κ.τ.λ. would be a neat correction. All the original founders were not extant in local memories. On the other hand, if it is meant that some places were nameless, we might read ἅπασιν ὑπῆρχ' ὀνόματα τοῖς τόποις. **JBB.**

P. 57, l. 6. τότε δ' ἄλλους. **B.**

P. 57, l. 9. Read Ἑρμοκρέοντος. **R.**

P. 60, l. 1. For τοῖς read τότε. **B.** See above, p. 168.

P. 64, l. 7. κατεδέξαντο for ἀπεδέξαντο. **W.**

P. 64, l. 8. Ὑψηλίδον for Ὑψηλίδου. **W.**

P. 65, l. 2. αὐξανόμενη? **HR.**

P. 66, l. 5. πολεμικά. **B.**

P. 66, l. 8. Read ἀπὸ τῆς . . . συμμαχίας. **W.** See above, p. 168.

P. 67, l. 8. Should we not read δεσποτικώτερον for δεσποτικωτέρως? **R.**

P. 67, last line but one. For φόρων, which seems to be merely repeated in συμμαχων, read perhaps εἰσφορῶν. **LW.**

P. 68, l. 9. ἀλλαι δὲ νῆες αἱ τοὺς φόρους ἄγουσαι τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κυάμου δισχυλίους ἄνδρας. A participle is required for ἄνδρας, and its disappearance is easily explained if we recognise that αἱ τοὺς φόρους ἄγουσαι is an adscript. The original words were ἀλλαι δὲ νῆες δέκα φέρουσαι τοὺς κ.τ.λ. The next stage was ἀλλαι δὲ νῆες (αἱ τοὺς φόρους ἄγουσαι) δέκα, φέρουσαι, whence, owing to homoioteleuton ἀλλαι δὲ νῆες αἱ τοὺς φόρους ἄγ<ο>ν<σ>αι δέκα φέρ<ο>ν<σ>αι. **JBB.** For φόρους read φορολόγους. **T.** φρονρούς, cf. p. 154. **B.** Is the word lost before ἄγουσαι the participle συλλέγουσαι? **R.**

P. 68, l. 12. Perhaps διαστίτησις for διοίκησις. **W.**

P. 71, l. 7. ἐφαρεθέντας for ἀφαρεθέντας; cf. Thuc. IV. 38. **W.** See above, p. 164.

P. 73, l. 10. ἀλλ' ἡ ἔκτω. **B.**

P. 76, l. 10. For δικασταῖς read δικαστηριοῖς, as in p. 75. **B.**

P. 76, l. 11. ἀφ' ὧν αἰτιῶνται τινες χεῖρω γενέσθαι. A subject for γενέσθαι is wanted — something like τὰ κατὰ τὰ δικαστήρια. **JBB.**

P. 78, l. 7. I should now say that διεδίδον is quite corrupt, and has replaced some such phrase as διετέλει δημαγωγῶν with which κατέλυσε will very well agree in the sense of 'deposed.' **R.** καὶ χρόνον μὲν τινα διεδίδον. Perhaps διωβολίαν ἐδίδον (*scil.* Kleophon). **JBB.** See above, p. 169a.

P. 82, l. 7. ἡ ζήμιοι ἢ προσκαλῆται ἢ εἰσάγη

ἡ εἰς δικαστήριον. So MS.; the editor omits ἡ before εἰς. Read ἡ ἀγῆ εἰς δικαστήριον, a formal pleonasm. **JBB.**

P. 84, ll. 2, 3. For τῶν ἄλλων ὁσίων read τῶν ὁσίων or τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ὁσίων. οἱ is meant for οἱ. ἑλληνοταμίας appears to be an error for ταμίας. We want a word like ταμίας to govern χρημάτων, and the mention of the Hellenotamiae is absolutely inconsistent with lines 8, 9, besides their being out of place between the treasurers of the *ιερά* and those of the *ὅσια χρήματα*. **HR.**

P. 86, l. 6. Surely *εὐρόμενος* is the tense demanded, not *εὐρισκόμενος*. **T., HR.**

P. 88, l. 3. ὅταν τοῖς ἀστοῖς γίγνηται μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων βουλευεῖν. Perhaps we should read τοῖς αὐτοῖς, 'the same senators, the old members.' We find (p. 156) that the office of senator was the only civil office which could be held twice. **T.**

P. 90, l. 3. ἡττηθέντες δὲ κτέ. The subject 'Ἀθηναῖοι' is lost. **HR.**

P. 90, l. 12. γιγνομένοις. **B.**

P. 91, l. 4. τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ νικῶντας. Read τὴν ναυμαχίαν. **T.**

P. 91, l. 7. διὰ τοὺς παροργίσαντας, a very doubtful form. Read either ὀργίσαντας or παροργήσαντας. **JBB.**

P. 91, l. 10. οὐχ ὑπήκουσεν ἐξαπατηθέντες as in 95, 7. **HR.**

P. 93, l. 1. διασώζειν for διασώσκειν. **HR., B.**

P. 93, last line. ἐκ τῶν χιλίων should perhaps go out, as a gloss written by some one who had a confused recollection of a *χίλιοι* in other states, such as the *χίλιοι λογάδες* at Argos, or of similar numbers in Plato's *Laws*. **GEM.** Om. ἐκ τῶν. **HR.**

P. 95. εἰ μὴ μανίων ἢ γῆρων ἢ γυναικί πειθομένος. I imagine ἢ has fallen out, either after μὴ, μὴ [ἢ] μανίων, or before ἢ γῆρων. That *μανίων* is possibly a participle like *γῆρων* is not quite disproved by the fact that in Demosth. 1133 it is undeniably a genitive plural. **E.**

P. 95, l. 10. ἀπέκτεινον. **B.**

P. 96, l. 11. τῶν <ἐ>γεγραμμένων, as in 107, 9 ὅταν δ' ἐ<γ> γράφονται, and 121, 12 ἐντεῦθεν <ἐ>γέγραπται or ἐνταῦθ' ἐγγέγραπται. **HR.**

P. 97, l. 9. Om. ἢ. **HR.**

P. 99, l. 6. Om. μέν. **B.**

P. 99, l. 7. Δημάρετον. **B.**

P. 99, l. 14. αὐτοὺς for αὐτήν. **HR., B.**

P. 101, l. 5. τιμητὰς ἐλίσθαι τρεῖς ἐκατέρων. Read ἐκάτερον (cf. τὸν κεκτημένον, l. 3). **JBB., HR.**

P. 101, l. 13. ἀπογράφεται. **B.**

P. 101, l. 15. Perhaps εἰ τίς τινα ἀντοχειρίᾳ ἐπὶ τίσει χειρὶ ὥσπερ ἀντοχειρία ἐκτισσεῖται. **HR.**

P. 102, l. 6. ἐπινοούντων μὲν. **B.**

P. 102, l. 9. συνιδὼν τὸ πλῆθος is hardly right. Perhaps συνιδὼν τὸ πλῆθος πάθος. **JBB.**

P. 103, l. 13. For ἄμα read ὅλως δέ, comparing 35, 4. **B.**

P. 104, l. 12. Om. ἢ. **B.**

P. 104, l. 13. συνοικησάντων, cf. p. 171. **B.**

P. 104, last line. Read for συνενεμήθησαν either διεν. or κατεν. **HR.**

P. 105, l. 2. δευτέρα δὲ καὶ πρώτη μετὰ ταῦτα [ἐξ]έχονσα πολιτείας τάξεις ἢ ἐπὶ Θησέως γενομένη. MS. πολιτεῖαν ταξίν. Read κατέχονσα πολιτεῖαν τάξεις. **JBB.**

P. 106, l. 3. ὀγδόη δ' ἢ τῶν τετρακοσίων κατάστασις. MS. ὀγδόην. Read ὀγδόη δ' ἢν. **JBB.**

P. 106, last line but one. σοφίζομένων. **B.**

P. 108, l. 11. ἢ μὴ ἐλεύθερος seems to have been lost after ἐτῶν. **HR.**

P. 109, l. 2. [εἴ]τα (or [εἴ]τα) δὲ τῶν φυλετῶν κτέ. **HR.**

P. 109, l. 6. οὕτω διεξάγουσι. **B.**

P. 109, l. 7. γενομένης with Harp. **B.**

P. 110, l. 8. Something seems to have been lost after ἐπιμελητοῦ in reference to καταλογεῖς (cap. 49), γραμματεῖς τοῦ δήμου (cap. 54), and μυστηρίων ἐπιμεληταί (cap. 57). **HR.**

P. 111, l. 10. καὶ ὅτι ἐν ἐκάστῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ὅτι οὐ καθήκει οὗτοι προγράφοντι. The fourth and fifth letters of καθήκει are uncertain. Perhaps καθέξει. κατέχω might well have been a technical word in the sense required. **JBB.**

P. 112, l. 12. κἂν for ἐν. **B.**

P. 113, l. 3. τρία δ' ὁσίων should come close to χρηματίζειν. **HR.**

P. 116, l. 5. Omit τ' as in 100, 2. **HR., B.**

P. 117, l. 10. καὶ ἐπωνυμίαν εἶχεν ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ τυτάνου. Perhaps ἔσχεν rather than εἶχεν. **JBB.** [Possible. **K.**]

P. 119, l. 8. εἰς ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς. Read ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς ἐκάστης. **JBB.**

P. 120, l. 6. καὶ τῶν [προδοτῶν]? **HR.**

P. 120, l. 9. We should probably read τὸν [πριμμενον καὶ ὀπόσον ἂν] πρίηται. **T.**

P. 120, l. 17. At the end supply [ῶν]. **WRP.**

P. 120, l. 20. παραδίδωσι, not κατακυροῖ, should be, I think, restored. **WRP.**

P. 120, l. 20. πρῆτανείας [κάτεροι]? **HR.**

P. 121, l. 3. ἐπιστολίων. Is this 'columns' of the accounts? Cf. 'Glossae Graeco-Latinae,' vol. ii. p. 310 of Götze's *Corpus Glossar. Latin.*, ἐπιστόλιον, columella. Or is it an error for ἐπιστολίων? **E.**

P. 121, l. 11. κἂν τις ἐλλίπη καταβολὴν ἐντεῦθεν γέγραπται. What is the force of ἐντεῦθεν? Read τὸ ἐλλειφθέν. **JBB.**

P. 121, l. 18. The supplement seems to be καὶ [παραδίδω]σιν. **T.**

P. 122, l. 7. For τοῦτον read τὸ αὐτοῦ. **B.** τὸ ἑαυτοῦ (comparing P. 159. 2). **HR.**

P. 122, l. 10. ἀναγνούς for ἀκούσας. **B.**

P. 122, ll. 18, 19. The correction of τρέφειν to τρέχειν is suggested by *Eth.* ii. 6, 2—ὁμοίως ἢ τοῦ ἵππου ἀρετὴ ἵππον τε σπουδαῖον ποιεῖ καὶ ἀγαθὸν δρομεῖν καὶ ἐνεγκεῖν τὸν ἐπιβάτην καὶ μέναι τοῖς πολεμίοις. It will be observed that the same passage explains μέναι. **T.**

P. 122, c. 49. Δοκιμάζει δὲ καί, &c. Perhaps we should write this passage as follows: Δοκιμάζει δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἵππους ἢ βουλή, κὰν μὲν τις καλῶς ἔχων] κακῶς δοκῇ τρέχειν (MS. τρέφειν), ζημιοὶ τῷ σίτῳ, τοῖς δὲ μὴ δυναμένοις τρέχειν (MS. [τ]ρεφειν) ἢ μὴ θέλουσι μέναι ἀναδοῦσι (MS. αναγοῦσι, with a correction over na which looks like λγ) τροχὸν ἐπὶ τὴν [ἡνίαν], καὶ ὁ τοῦτο παθὼν ἀδόκιμος ἐστὶ. **E.**

P. 125, l. 1. Perhaps ἐντὸς ὄρων τοῦ τείχους? Below ὀχετοὺς μετέωρον εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν ἔκρουν ἐχὼ ὄ[σας] ποιεῖν. **B.**

P. 127, l. 3. ὁ ἐν ἀγορᾷ σίτος ἀργὸς ὦνιος ἔσται. We must either read ὁ ἐν ἀγορᾷ ἀργὸς σίτος, or regard ἀργὸς as a gloss. **JBB.** ἢ ἀργὸς <ὦν> ὦνιος. **K.**

P. 128, l. 11. ἀποδιδῶ. **B.**

P. 128, l. 14. (εἰσὶ δ' ἔμνηροι) . . . ἔτι δ' αἰκείας καὶ ἐρανοικὰς καὶ κοινωνικὰς καὶ ἀνδραπόδων καὶ ὑποζυγίων καὶ τριηραρχίας καὶ τραπεζητικὰς. Read ἐρανοικαί, κοινωνικαί, τριηραρχικαί, and τραπεζητικαί. **JBB.**

P. 128, l. 16. αἰκείας; perhaps <ἐμπορ>ικὰς, as in Pollux and Harpokraton. **B.**

P. 130, l. 9. παραδίδοσι τοῖς ἐπὶ τοῖς τῆς φυλῆς τοῦ φεύγοντος δικάζουσιν. These obscure magistrates are also mentioned on p. 146, τοὺς δὲ τὴν φυλὴν δικάζοντας. If οἱ δικάζοντες was the name by which they were generally known, the genitive τῆς φυλῆς may be right. For ἐπὶ τοῖς perhaps read ἐπιτρόποις τοῖς. **JBB.**

P. 131, l. 1. ἐφηβοὶ οἱ. **B.**

P. 134, c. 54. πρότερον μὲν οὗτος ἦν χειροτονητός, καὶ τοὺς ἐνδοξοτάτους καὶ *ἀπιστοτάτους* [ἔχει]σθόνουν· καὶ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς στήλαις πρὸς ταῖς συμμαχίας καὶ προξεν[αῖ]ς καὶ *πολλ/εῖαις* οὗτος ἀναγράφεται· νῦν δὲ γέγονε κληρωτός.

I suspect that ἀπειστοτάτους, 'least liable to seduction,' should be read. Hesych. ἀπιστος· ἀπαράπιστος, ἀπειθής. Σοφοκλῆς Τρωίλῳ. In this passage of Hesychius, Nauck, in his *Fragm. Trag. Graecorum*, writes ἀπειστος ἀπαράπειστος. Nauck refers to Lobeck on Ajax, pp. 139, 140. [Or it may be a mere error for ἀρίστους.] The erased letters in πολλ/εῖαις were perhaps the remains of μ followed by π, πομπείαις. **E.**

P. 135, l. 3. πολιτείας is right, 'stelae conferring citizenship.' **WRP.** See above, p. 164.

P. 135, l. 8. οὐδένης...ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἀναγνῶναι. Read ἀλλ' ἢ. **B., B., HR.**

P. 137, l. 3. ἐναντῷ γίγνεται. **B.**

P. 140, l. 5. ἕκαστος for ἐκάτερος. **B.**

P. 141, l. 14. ἡγάλισκον = ἀνῆλισκον. **B.**

P. 142, l. 11. εἰ [πλείονες τὸν αὐτὸν θέλουσιν] ἐπιτροποῦν αὐτῶν ἐγγράψαι. **WRP.**

P. 142, last line. I would propose to read καὶ τοὺς ἐπιτρόπους, ἐὰν μὴ τροφὴν δῶσι, as the passage quoted from Harpocraton seems to suggest. **EBB.**

P. 143, l. 1. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἄρχων. **B.**

P. 143, l. 10. τίθησι. Read διατίθησι. **HR.**

P. 144, l. 10. Should we not read οἱ ἐφέται after ξένον? Otherwise there is no subject for δικάζουσιν in the last line. ἐν τῷ in lines 10 and 13 should perhaps be omitted. **EBB.**

P. 145, l. 2. μὲν wrongly supplied. **B.**

P. 145, ll. 2-6. δικάζουσιν σκοτ]αῖοι καὶ ὑπαῖθριοι (Arist. *Politeia*, p. 145). This suggestion has been made by several critics. I daresay it is right, but it should be pointed out that the statement does not refer to the Areopagus. The preceding lines should be thus restored and punctuated: τοῦτ' ὁ ἐν Φρεαττοῖ δικάζουσιν αὐτὸς δὲ ἀπολογεῖται παρ' ὁρμιστάμενος ἐν πλοίῳ. δικάζουσι δ' οἱ λαχόντες ταῦτα δικάσται] πλὴν τῶν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ γιγνομένων· εἰσάγει δ' ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ δικάζουσιν κ.τ.λ. ταῦτα here means all the kinds of 'δίκαι φόνου καὶ τραύματος' which have been enumerated. λαχόντες ἐφέται is, of course, impossible, and indeed the ἐφέται have no place here, as they had disappeared before Aristotle's time. The statement in question, then, refers to a procedure modelled on that of the ἐφέται, which may again have corresponded to that of the Areopagus. **WRP.**

P. 145, l. 3. Full stop after πλοίῳ. **B.**

P. 145, l. 9. καὶ οὐδεὶς τὴν α[ιτί]αν δύναται ἐμβαλεῖν αὐτῷ. Read δ[ε]ξί]αν. **B.**

P. 147, l. 15. πάντα δικαστήρια. Read τὰ for πάντα. **HR.**

P. 149, l. 13. ἀργύρια καὶ χρυσία for χρυσά. **B.**

P. 151, l. 3. ἐκκηρύξαι, see Lys. iii. 45. **B.**

P. 152, l. 6. γίνεται <καὶ> τούτων. **B.**

P. 155, l. 4. [ὀβολὸς π]ροστίθεται. Om. δέκα προστίθεται (which arose from ἱππορ-ΤΙΘΕΤΑΙ, where ἱ stands for the obolos). **B.**

	I	II.	III	IV
α	$\delta \alpha \delta$	α	$\alpha \alpha \lambda$	$\alpha \alpha \alpha \alpha$
β	$\beta \beta \beta \beta$	β	β	$\beta \beta$
γ	$\gamma \gamma \gamma$	γ	$\gamma \gamma$	$\gamma \gamma$
δ	$\Delta \Delta$	Δ	$\Delta \Delta$	$\Delta \Delta$
ϵ	$\nu \rho \epsilon$	$\epsilon \leftarrow$	$\nu \rho \nu$	$\nu \rho \epsilon \nu \epsilon$
ζ	$z z$	z	z	$z z z z$
η	$\gamma \gamma \eta \eta \eta$	$\eta \eta \eta \eta$	$\eta \eta \gamma$	$\eta \eta \eta \eta \eta$
θ	$\theta \theta \theta$	θ	$\theta \theta$	$\theta \theta \theta$
ι	ι	ι	$\iota \iota$	$\iota \iota$
κ	$\kappa \kappa$	κ	$\kappa \kappa \kappa$	$\kappa \kappa \kappa$
λ	$\lambda \gamma \lambda \gamma \alpha \gamma$	$\lambda \lambda \lambda \lambda$	$\lambda \eta \gamma^{(\kappa)} \lambda \gamma$	
μ	$\mu \mu \mu$	$\mu \mu$	$\mu \mu$	$\mu \mu \mu$
ν	$\nu \nu \nu \nu$	$\nu \nu$	$\nu \nu \omega, \nu (\omega \nu) \nu \nu \chi \nu$	
ξ	$\xi \xi$	ξ	ξ	$\xi \xi$
\omicron	$\omicron \omicron$	\omicron	$\omicron, \tau^{(\tau \omicron)}$	$\omicron \omicron$
π	$\pi \pi \pi \pi \omega^{(\pi \pi)} \pi$		$\pi \pi \pi$	$\pi \pi \pi \pi \pi$
ρ	$\rho \rho \rho$	ρ	$\rho \rho \rho$	$\rho \rho \rho$
σ	$\sigma \sigma \sigma$	σ	$\sigma \sigma \sigma$	$\sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma$
τ	$\tau \tau \tau \pi^{(\tau \tau)}$	$\tau \tau$	$\tau \tau \tau \tau$	$\tau \tau \tau$
υ	$\gamma \gamma \nu \gamma$	τ	$\gamma \nu$	$\nu \tau$
ϕ	$\phi \phi$	$\phi \phi$	ϕd	$\phi \phi \phi$
χ	$\chi \chi$	χ	χ	χ
ψ	\dagger	\dagger	$\dagger \dagger$	$\dagger \dagger$
ω	$\omega \omega$	ω	ω	$\omega \omega \omega$

[We are glad to be allowed to insert the preceding Alphabet, which cannot fail to be of great use to those who are interesting themselves in the text of the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*. It contains the ordinary forms of the letters in each of the four hands in which the papyrus is written; I being found in cols. 1—12, II in cols. 13—20, III in cols. 21—24 together with the fragments at the end, IV in cols. 25—30.]

UN-ARISTOTELIAN WORDS AND PHRASES.

I follow the example of the editor of the *Classical Review* in putting down a few things that have struck me as departures from Aristotelian usage. Of course I have trusted mainly to the Berlin Index. I have put a * to the things for which some sort of parallel seems forthcoming.

P. 3, l. 14. τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς ἴσταναν. Not an Aristotelian phrase: read perhaps καθίστασαν.

*P. 7, l. 11, and p. 129, l. 10. αὐτοτελεῖς. Not used by Aristotle in a political sense.

*P. 9, l. 3. κυρίως. Often as Aristotle uses κύριος of political or judicial authority, and fond as he is of κυρίως in certain senses, he seems never to use the adverb in a political or judicial sense.

P. 12, l. 4. εἰ δέ τις..., ὅταν ἔδρα...ῃ, ἐκλείπει τὴν σύνοδον, ἀπέτινον κ.τ.λ. Is there any parallel for this syntax? Can it be right?

P. 13, l. 7. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς σώμασιν ἦσαν δεδεμένοι. The figurative use of δεδεμένος, like 'nexus,' seems to have no parallel in any author. See list of emendations.

P. 14, l. 2. τὴν ἐλεγείαν. Aristotle uses τὰ ἐλεγεία. ἐλεγεία is quoted from late authors only.

P. 48, l. 10. οἱ καὶ τῇ φύσει τῶν ἐπιφανῶν ἦσαν. Cf. the emendation of φύσει for ῥήσει in p. 14, l. 8. Aristotle does not use φύσις in this way and, as a friend points out to me, he expressly contrasts φύσις and γένος in *Pol.* i. 12, 1259b, 14. τὰ πράγματα for 'fortune,' 'position,' in p. 14, l. 9, is not Aristotelian either.

*P. 16, l. 12. τοὺς νόμους ὑποποιήσάμενον. *Pol.* viii. 4, 1303 b, 24, is hardly parallel.

P. 19, l. 7. τελὲν πεντακοσμιεῖσθαι. Is not this quite an unusual phrase?

P. 28, l. 17. παραλλάξας δόξης, if right, seems also unusual. [Plato has οἷον τοξότην φαῦλον παραλλάξαι τοῦ σκοποῦ, *Theaet.* 194 A, cf. *Leg.* xii. 957 B.]

P. 50, l. 18. συνεβάλλετο δ' οὐκ ἐλαχίστην

μοῖραν κ.τ.λ. The phrase is Platonic, but μοῖρα = μέρος seems unknown to Aristotle.

P. 51, l. 6. προσοργισθέντες τῷ γενομένῳ. L. and S. quote προσοργίζομαι only from Plutarch and Josephus.

P. 55, l. 2. ἀναμίσγεσθαι is an Ionic form. But Aristotle uses the verb (though not the form) in the very similar passage, *Pol.* vii. 1, 1319b, 25.

P. 50, l. 14. ἡ δὲ Πυθία προέφεν αἰεὶ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις χρηστηριαζομένοις ἐλευθεροῦν τὰς Ἀθήνας. προέφεν ἐλευθεροῦν τὰς Ἀθήνας is taken from Herod. v. 63, 1 προφένει σφι τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐλευθεροῦν. προφένει is not Attic in this sense. χρηστηριάζεσθαι is not Attic, but constant in Herod. αἰεὶ is not an Attic form, but in this text it occurs often. Is this lapse into Ionisms Aristotelian? [Other instances in which the language of the original authority has been preserved are the following: P. 41, l. 5. παραβατούσης, used of the same incident by Cleidemus (fl. 460 B.C.) *ap.* Ath. xiii. 609, where also we are told that Phye was a στεφανώπῳλις. P. 39, last line, is taken word for word from Herod. i. 60 περιελανόμενος τῇ στάσι ὁ Μεγακλῆς. P. 39, l. 8. οὕτω τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐρριζωμένης reminds us of Herod. i. 60 τὴν τυραννίδα οὕτω κάρτα ἐρριζωμένην ἔχον ἀπώλετο. See also the passages referred to in Mr. Kenyon's note on c. 20. This close resemblance may serve to confirm the reading καταγούσης in p. 40, l. 4 (for which καταζούσης has been suggested), as we read in Herod. i. 60 προδρόμους κήρυκας προπέμψαντες, bidding the Athenians receive into their acropolis the man whom αὐτὴ ἡ Ἀθηναῖα κατάγει, and (immediately after) ἐς τοὺς δῆμους φάτις ἀπίκετο ὡς Ἀθηναῖα Πεισίστρατον κατάγει.—Ed.]

P. 57, l. 7. στοχαζόμενον τοῦ πλήθους. Aristotle is fond of στοχάζεσθαι, but never, I think, uses it in this way—always of an end to be gained. [It is found in Plato, *Laches*, 178 B στοχαζόμενοι ('desiring to please') τοῦ συμβουλευομένου ἄλλα λέγονσι παρὰ τὴν αὐτῶν δόξαν, and Polyb. vi. 16, 1 ἡ σύγκλητος ἀναγκάζεται προσέχειν τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ στοχάζεσθαι τοῦ δήμου, *ib.* 5.—Ed.]

*P. 69, l. 4. πολιτεία...ὑποφερομένη. Cf. 95, 16. Not used in this way.

P. 73, l. 7. τοὺς ἐπικεῖς καὶ τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῶν εἰσώρων. Aristotle is fond of ἐπικεῖς, but always opposes οἱ ἐπικεῖς to οἱ πολλοί, ὁ δῆμος, &c. For two or three reasons I think this clause may be an 'adscript.'

P. 80, l. 5. ἀμφισβήτησις τῆς κρίσεως ἐστὶ. ἀ. occurs often in Aristotle, but not ἀ. τῆς κρίσεως.

P. 87, l. 7. τὸ νῦν εἶναι. Does Aristotle use any of the phrases with εἶναι?

P. 95, l. 6. *κακοπράγμονας*, 'mischievous.' Not an Aristotelian word.

P. 96, l. 9. *ὑπερεβάλλοντο*, 'postponed.' *ὑ.* is very rare in this sense in Attic, but occurs twice in the *Rhet. ad Alex.* Aristotle uses *ἀναβάλλεσθαι*, *Rhet.* iii. 10, 1411b, 14, and that word occurs in this treatise, p. 102, l. 6.

P. 97, l. 3. *ὁ μὲν εἰς (νόμος)...ὁ δ' ἕτερος*. Is *ὁ μὲν εἰς* either Aristotelian or Attic? (I have since found *ὁ μὲν εἰς* in *Pol.* viii. 11, 1314a, 30, but it is rather different there, as referring to *ἄτερος* in 1313a, 34.)

P. 99, l. 12. *ἐσπουδάξον μὴ κατελθεῖν τοὺς ἀπὸ Φυλῆς*. Any example of this construction? [In *Xen. Hell.* vi. 3, 11 we have *ἐσπουδάσατε αὐτονόμους τὰς πόλεις γενέσθαι*.—Ed.]

P. 122, l. 18. *κἂν μὲν τις καλῶς ἔχων κακῶς δοκῇ τρέφειν* (i.e. *ἵππον*). If the text is right, *κ. ἔχων* is used in the very unusual sense of 'being well off.' But no doubt *τρέφειν*, which had occurred to me as well as to others, is to be received.

*Pp. 124, l. 8, and 143, l. 11. *ὡς ἔπος*

εἰπεῖν. The *Index Aristotelicus*, giving innumerable instances of *ὡς εἰπεῖν*, gives only one of *ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν*, *Met.* iii. 5, 1009b, 16.

P. 147, l. 17. *κυροῦσι*. The only parallel is quoted by Steph. Byz. from 'Αριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Τενεδίων πολιτείᾳ. Neither does Aristotle use the substantive *κύρος*, which occurs in this treatise, p. 94, l. 9. But read perhaps *κατακυροῦσι* as in p. 17, l. 6, and p. 120, l. 2.

P. 150, l. 4. *πολεμεῖ*, 'conducts the war.' Any parallel?

H. RICHARDS.

The phrase *ὅτε μὲν...ὅτε δέ*, which is so common in the *Politics*, does not, I believe, occur in this treatise.

J. B. MAYOR.

Another argument against Aristotelian authorship may be drawn from the use of *μέλλω*. Aristotle almost invariably uses the future infinitive after it, the author of this treatise the present (pp. 21, 47, 71).

ARTHUR PLATT.

THE NEW FRAGMENTS OF THE ANTIOPE.

Fr. B 4. I prefer *ἵκται δὲ πάντως εἰς τοσόνδε συμφορᾶς* ('matters have in any case reached...') [So also Prof. Campbell.]

Fr. B 4. The construction is perhaps more probably of this kind:

*καὶ σοὶ μὲν οὕτω, μήτηρ, ἐξανδῶ τάδε·
σὶ δ' ὅς τὸ λαμπρὸν αἰθέρος ναίεις πέδον
αἰτῶ τοσούτων...*

Fr. C (left col.) 10, *ἀλαλίζετ' ὦ μέγα...* The letters at the end of the line suggest *ἀνασείω μέλος* (cf. *Ar. Ach.* 347 *ἐμέλλετ' ἄρ' ἅπαντες ἀνασεῖν βοήν*), but metre perhaps refuses it.

Fr. C (left col.) 13. In view of the reading of this line in Stobaeus, I feel very sure that *ΑΙΜΑΤΟC* is merely an error (whether of the MS. or not) for *ΔΙΚΑ ΤΟΙ*.

Fr. C (right col.) 50, *ἐκλιποῦσ' ἐδώλια* should be considered.

Fr. C (right col.) 51, *..τείχος? οὐ τειχοποιῶν?*

Fr. C (right col.) 56, *καὶ λέκτρ' ὁ μὲν Θεβαῖα λήφεται γάμων* (cf. *Phoen.* 59 *τάμὰ λέκτρα μητρώων γάμων*).

W. HEADLAM.

EURIPIDES, *Antiope*, *Fragm.* C. (1) ll. 43, 44, published by Professor Mahaffy in *Hermathena*, Feb. 1891, p. 47:—

NO. XLI. VOL. V.

*χωρεῖτε []ς ἄστυ δ' Ἰσμηνοῦ πάρα
ἐπτάστομον πύλαισι[v] ἐξαρτύετε.*

Read

χωρεῖτε Θήβας, ἄστυ δ' Ἰσμηνοῦ πάλιν κ.τ.λ.

(2) *Ib.* ll. 67—71, p. 48:—

*ἐγὼ δὲ σὺν Διὶ
Ἑρμῇ[ι] Ἄρε[ος] εἰς κρήνην [β]αλῶ
γυναῖκα θάψας τησ[]νονσα γῆς
νασμοῖσι τέγγη πέδια Θεβαίας χθονός.*

For ll. 67—69, read—

*ἐγὼ δὲ σὺν Διὶ
Ἑρμῇ πιθόμενος Ἄρεος εἰς κρήνην βαλῶ
γυναῖκα θάψας, τῇ σ' ὅπως περὶ νουσα γῆς
κ.τ.λ.*

J. E. SANDYS.

I venture to suggest that line 11 and a portion of line 12 in the C fragment of *Antiope* should be given to Lycus instead of the Chorus. They seem to be the outcry of one invoking succour.

For the unintelligible *φύσιν* in line 27 I would propose *τὴν ταλαίπωρον φορὰν*.

R. GARNETT.

NOTES.

VERG. *Aen.* vi. 743.

Quisque suos patimur Manes.

Manes is used by Vergil in two senses: (1) general—the 'Benign Powers' of the lower world, e.g. *Georg.* iv. 489 *ignoscenda quidem, scirent si ignoscere Manes*; *Aen.* xii. 646 *vos, o mihi Manes | este boni quoniam Superis aversa voluntas*: (2) individual—the ghost or spirit of a dead man. Probably the general meaning is earlier than the other: the plural name applied to the individual being best explained by supposing that, as in the idiomatic 'plural of respect' the individual is as it were merged in the class to which he belongs, so here the influence of the single spirit is reverentially and with a sense of mystery associated and identified with all those influences of the spirit world, or of its rulers, which are denoted by the collective title of deprecation, *Manes* or 'Benign Powers.'

We have to do in this passage with the first of these meanings. In no sense could it be said that we endure each of us his own shade (or ghost); and there is no ground for saying that 'shade' is put for 'life' or 'doom' as a shade. Whereas 'We suffer each for himself the Powers of the other world' means plainly 'The treatment of the *Manes* is different for each of us': *suos Manes* = 'the *Manes* in their relation to him,' i.e. their treatment of him. It is impossible to say *patimur regem*; but *patimur superbum regem* = *patimur superbiam regis*. *Ruptae lectore columnae* would not be Latin: but in *assiduo ruptae lectore columnae* 'assiduo lectore' = *assiduitate lectoris*. *Curatus inaequali tonsore capillos* 'trimmed with a barber cutting awry' is possible because 'inaequali tonsore' = *inaequalitate* (or *inaequali cultello*) *tonsoris*. *Scriberis Vario fortis...Maeonii carminis alite*, 'you shall have the epic genius of Varius to record your valour.' In all these cases, the adjective makes the expression impersonal, as *ademptus Hector* = the loss of Hector. So here: 'each has his own experience of the Benign Powers of the world beyond the grave, who plague us for our good'; 'the *Manes* deal with each of us according to our need, and we abide their dealings.' So Statius *Theb.* viii. 84 (quoted by Conington) *At tibi quos, inquit, Manes? (sc. attribuant) 'How are you to be punished?'*

In the same context, it seems impossible that *Titania astra* (725) can mean only the sun: no account could be given of the plural. The sense required is 'the sun and all the stars'; and this may be justified by regarding *Titania* as an attempt to represent in Latin the idiomatic Greek phrase *τὰ περὶ τὸν ἥλιον*.

In favour of transposing the two lines 743, 4, *quisque...tenemus*, and putting them after 747, it may be suggested that 743 ends in *igni*, 747 in *ignem*, and that the resemblance deceived the scribe, causing him to omit 745-7, which were afterwards inserted in the wrong place, perhaps because of the

fitness of 'Quisque suos patimur Manes' after 740-2. The transposition gives a very suitable antithesis between *pauci* (the few elect souls who remain in Elysium) and *omnes* (the souls waiting to return to the upper world): and it delivers us from the alternative of either a needlessly awkward parenthesis, or the supposition that a second purgatorial process goes on in Elysium.

R. WHITELAW.

* *

SOPHOCLES, *Ajax*, 651 (see *Classical Review*, IV. p. 397, V. p. 66).—I hope it is not sheer obstinacy that makes me adhere to my view about the meaning of this passage, in spite of Mr. Whitelaw's note. He has not touched upon my chief objections to the interpretation which he supports. These were (and still are): (1) that *βαφή* is everywhere else used of hardening, and seems to have been a recognized metaphor in that sense; (2) that I know of no passage written within 500 years of the time of Sophocles which even suggests any other kind of *βαφή* for iron or steel [I find that in my former note the reference to Blümler is wrongly printed vol. i. for vol. iv.]; (3) that *θηλόνυ* is not the word which would be used to express annealing. I cannot but think that the addition of 'or flexible' in Mr. Whitelaw's rendering admits the difficulty of his position. Surely 'soft or weak' would more nearly translate *θηλός*, whereas a word meaning 'flexible or tough' would be needed to express the process of annealing. Indeed the very word *θηλός* might well be used to describe *μάλαξ* and *ἀπαλότης* which are said to be the effect upon iron of fire as contrasted with that of water (Plut. *def. orac.* 47 p. 436 C).

As regards the 'second immersion' in modern manufacture, it appears to me from a study of the article which Mr. Whitelaw cites from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* that steel is annealed in most cases (exceptions are noted) by *dry* heat and *dry* (i.e. slow and spontaneous) cooling. In modern phrase therefore to use the word 'immersion' would be an odd way of distinguishing the annealing process from the hardening, and it would be at least as strange to use *βαφή* for that purpose in Greek, even if we assume that both processes were known so early.

As to the construction, I confess that I see no more difficulty in *βαφῇ καρτερεῖ* as a dative of cause than in other recognized instances, such as *τελευτῶν νόσφ.* Sophocles can supply examples of this case that undoubtedly are harsh, but I should not class this among them. Lastly I must demur to the argument from metre. The rhythm, according to the rendering which I prefer, would be decidedly objectionable if the whole sentence ended (with the line) at *σῶμα*: but, unless my ear misleads me, it is not objectionable at all when the sentence is read on to its end at *γυναικός*.

G. E. MARINDIN.

CORRESPONDENCE.

March 12.

SIR,—My attention has been called to a controversy between Mr. Hobhouse and Mr. C. Torr *à propos* of a mistake in a recent book of mine. May I venture to plead in behalf of serious discussion in place of such trivialities?

When speaking in passing of the friendship of Pontic tyrants with Athens, and merely to note that fact, I said that 'Leucon had obtained this friendship by means of large gifts of corn': I should have said that 'Leucon had obtained this friendship by means of granting trade facilities

which amounted to large gifts of corn.' So Grote describes the facts, and so Demosthenes, the Athenians, and Mr. Hobhouse, rightly understood them. But what matter? Does it affect, in the smallest degree, my argument? Let Mr. Torr clothe himself in infallibility, but confine himself to the office of universal censor, instead of producing infallible books which nobody can possibly read. His criticisms are always of value to an honest author, who is glad to correct even the most trivial inaccuracies; they may mislead careless readers, who only count, and do not weigh, objections.

To state, or to insinuate, that in a book containing many thousand statements the occasional occurrence of such flaws is a proof of general incompetence, or to state that all the errors carefully sought out and paraded are fair specimens of the rest of the book, is either to make an assertion which nobody is likely to believe, or to circulate a malicious falsehood concerning what *may* be a book of some value.

But I can hardly think your readers green enough to believe any critic when he says that he has left aside graver blunders than those which he enumerates, and which he has discovered, with manifest pride. This is however what I see said every day in notices of serious books, and even by men who are not infallible.

Let me conclude with something better than this useless protest against the absurdities of pedantry. As regards the *Antiope*

Frag. B. 15, Profs. Blass and Wil-Möllerndorf independently suggested to me that this line belonged to the chorus, and not the previous speaker (as Mr. Bury and I supposed). I then again studied the vestiges at the opening of B. 16 and read $\pi\tau\rho$, with room for two letters before and after. Mr. Bury then found me the required $\sigma\kappa\eta\pi\tau\rho\omega\iota$, and we also discovered that the previous word was not $\tau\upsilon\rho\rho\alpha\nu\iota\kappa\omicron\nu$ but $\tau\upsilon\rho\rho\alpha\nu\iota\kappa\omega\iota$: so then the lines now read

ἀλλ' αὐτὸς] εἰ χρὴ δοῦναι τυραννικῶι
σκηπτρῶι λυκὸς παρέσσι σιγῶμεν φίλοι.

Even the front of the κ and the first half of the ω are visible.

Does it not follow from this that the chorus of 'Theban old men' must have been mountain peasants, to whom Lycus' appearance was unknown? Or is this too strict an inference?

In the first line of C $\beta\alpha\lambda\omega\nu$ has crept in by some curious error for $\tau\upsilon\beta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, which is plain in the MS., and now lies before me in my rough copy. This of course proves that I am quite unfit to decipher any MS., and that probably the whole discovery of the *Antiope Fragments* is a mare's nest.

J. P. MAHAFFY.

[Mr. Torr is at present engaged in topographical investigations in the neighbourhood of Carthage, and his reply to the above is necessarily deferred till his return.]

MONTHLY RECORD.

GREAT BRITAIN.

In a cave in Deepdale near Buxton the Rev. J. C. Cox has brought to light some pottery of most elaborate Italian make, and excellent specimens of Samian and Rhone Valley cream-coloured ware, also home-made samples from different parts of Roman Britain. Besides the pottery, some remarkable bronze fibulae were discovered, of various patterns, and very perfect, the most noticeable being two of circular shape, with six projecting cusps, moulded into the form of a buckler or target, apparently a unique pattern. It is not easy to see why such objects should have been deposited in a remote cavern, unless they formed part of a treasure hidden away there.¹

FRANCE.

Rheims.—A remarkable mosaic of the time of Nero has been found here, measuring five feet each way. In the middle of the field are two gladiators, equipped with helmet, sword, and shield, engaged in combat. This design is surrounded by a richly-coloured and well-preserved border. The mosaic

was somewhat damaged in excavation, but can be repaired.²

SWITZERLAND.

Avenches (Canton Vaud).—During the excavations carried out by the Society *pro Aventico*, a wall eight feet in thickness was unearthed at the east end of the theatre, and also traces of the pavement round the theatre; a restoration of the whole building will soon be possible. The grave of a young girl, whose skeleton was much damaged, has also been found, with a great quantity of vases, pots, and small lamps made of fine red clay. Near the supposed site of a temple were found a marble hand, part of a foot, and the fragments of an inscribed marble tablet.³

ITALY.

Pompeii.—Excavations have been recently conducted in Insula iv. of the fifth region, and, together with many domestic objects or utensils of bronze, such as vases, buckets, lamps, and candelabra, a bronze statuette of Silenus has been found.⁴

² *Antiquary*. March 1891.

³ *Athenaeum*. 7 March 1891.

⁴ *Antiquary*. March 1891.

¹ *Antiquary*. March 1891.

Venetia.—On the high table-land of Asiago, in the territory of Sette Comuni, near Vicenza, has been discovered the site of a large village of pre-Roman times, with remains of huts bearing traces of devastation and of fire. In one of the huts a *victriciatus* (or coin stamped with a figure of Victory, value half a denarius) was found; it seems therefore extremely probable that this was a *pagus* of the Alpine populations which was attacked and destroyed by the Roman legions.¹

Romagna.—Some discoveries in the territory of Castrocaro have led to the belief that a necropolis must be hidden beneath the surface like that of Villanova. The objects found consist of bronzes such as are usually found in tombs.

Rome.—On the Monte Testaccio an ancient warehouse has been discovered with remains of pillars, capitals, and other worked marbles. In the Via Merulana a Roman sword was found, together with a figure of Nero and a medallion of Trajanus Decius.

Amongst epigraphical discoveries, another terminal stone of the Tiber has been found, in which repairs are spoken of as having been carried out under the Emperors Trajan and Hadrian. Two other terminal *cippi* were found last December in the Prati di Castello quarter, one of the work of Augustus, the other of Trajan, though the inscription of the latter has apparently been effaced in ancient times.

In *Regio I.* of the city, a rare Latin inscription was found, on the banks of the Tiber, near Monte Brianzo. It is dedicated to Mercury and other divinities, and bears the consulship of A.U.C. 754. It appears to refer to the worship of the Lares in the urban *regiones*, which Augustus restored in the year of Rome 745.²

Luni.—Within the boundaries of this ancient city, which is near Spezia, a portion of the forum was discovered, in which were found ten bases of statues with dedicatory inscriptions to various Roman Emperors.²

ASIA MINOR.

Hissarlik.—The last campaign of Drs. Schliemann and Dörpfeld was directed to the investigation of the successive fortification-walls on the hill of Pergamon, and especially of the second or Homeric city, of which several important strips were brought to light. On the east side is a piece of wall, two or three metres high and four metres wide, made of bricks, and raised on a foundation-ledge of stone and clay. On the side of the Acropolis, which is less steep and less capable of defence, the remains of several towers were discovered, at ten metres distance from one another. Dr. Dörpfeld has clearly proved that at the time of the second settlement the Pergamon had been enlarged twice on the southern side.

In the second city of Hissarlik were found the remains of many buildings, and the south-west fortification-wall, which in some places was preserved to a height of eight metres. This was completely cleared, and a sally-port was discovered, a little less than 1½ metres wide. In front of one of the buildings previously excavated, the existence of two *parastades* is now verified, which confirms the opinion that the building was really a propylaeon, and as such presents great similarity to the buildings of Tyrins.

In the excavations on the west of the so-called south-west gate the excavators observed the ground-plans of many of the buildings raised upon the ruins of the second city, and were thus able to verify the existence of seven different strata lying one on the other, as Dr. Schliemann had already in part

observed. Amongst the fortifications could be seen traces of *opus reticulatum*, and likewise outside the walls fresh tombs were discovered reaching down to Byzantine times.

The most remarkable discovery relative to the later period is that of the small theatre, or Odeion, of which the lower steps and marble pavement of the orchestra, with the base of an altar or statue, are still preserved. Two Greek inscriptions discovered in the same place are of the time of Tiberius, and contain two dedications in his honour, one by a certain Melanippides, the other by the *Boule* or *Demos*. Two imperial statues were also found in the same place.

Magnesia.—A singular inscription was discovered here by Dr. Humann. It records the finding, in an extraordinary way, of a small statue of Dionysos, and the institution in consequence of Bacchic rites conducted by foreign priestesses. The text is well preserved, and clearly says that in the year of the prytanis Akrodeimos, son of Diotimos, a violent storm having broken into pieces a large plane-tree, an image of Dionysos was found in the shattered trunk. The Magnesians were struck with fear, and forthwith sent envoys to Delphi, to ask for an explanation of the miraculous event. The oracle replied that they ought to found a temple to Dionysos, and obtain priestesses or maenads from Boeotia. Three women were granted them from Thebes, who established a *thiasos* called the *Πλατανιστρά*, in memory of the plane-tree.

The inscription is cut on a slab of marble, and once formed part of a marble altar; another inscription which it bears gives the name of the dedicator, Apollonius Mokolles, who styles himself ἀρχαῖος μυστῆς.³

CRETE.

Dr. Halbherr has found in this island many evidences of the reflex wave of Asian culture which, travelling from the eastern mainland, affected first the islands of the Mediterranean, and then, as his discoveries in the cave of Zeus on Mount Ida tend to prove, spread to Greece.

The most important of these results are numerous vases of the Mycenaean style, which have been illustrated by Dr. Orsi in the *Notizie dei Lincei*. They are of great size, and funereal, and by the novelty of their position and structure furnish us with new ideas on the sepulchral rites practised at so early a date. So far, the peculiar tombs in which these colossal urns have been found in Crete belong to an ordinary rank of life; but others may in all probability be found, belonging to chiefs or princes. The existence of such tombs and urns was hitherto unknown in Crete, and will bear out Adler's surmise that on this island, midway between Egypt, Asia Minor, and Greece, will be found the key that unlocks the mystery at present attending the first intermingling or conjunction of Oriental and Hellenic ideas of art.

These vases were found in 'Küppelgräber' (θολοὶ τάφοι) at Milatos and elsewhere, and show that Crete had at that date a population practising the same sepulchral rites and using the same decorative motives as their fellows on the Hellenic continent. Dr. Orsi attributes them to some Asian race, Phrygians or Carians, who can be shown to have influenced Greece in two separate streams: (1) through the islands of the Aegean, (2) through settlements in Crete.

The urns are so large as to resemble modern baths, and decorated with palmettes, fishes, and ducks, all of primitive design, the colours employed being dark

¹ *Antiquary.* March 1891.

² *Athenaeum.* 7 March 1891.

³ *Antiquary.* March 1891.

red and chestnut on a buff or cream-coloured ground. They are not large enough to contain the whole body of a man, although of sarcophagus-shape, and it is surmised that at the Mycenaean epoch such urns were made to receive either the bones alone, or else the half-burnt body. Hence partial combustion must have been practised, and this will be the most ancient known instance of an *ossilegium*, but an *ossilegium* without cremation. As for the style of the decorations, Dr. Orsi attributes it to the later stage of Mycenaean ornament, the third rather than the fourth period, when the artist, without knowledge of perspective or background, was endeavouring to represent a lake-scene in which plants, fishes, and ducks all appeared together.¹

Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift. 28 February.

O. A. Hoffmann, *Hermes und Kerykeion. Studie zur Urbedeutung des Hermes. Mit einer Tafel.* Marburg, 1890. [Review of, by W. H. Roscher.]

Hoffmann endeavours to prove that Hermes was originally a moon-god, and the caduceus a 'moon-sceptre.' The form of the caduceus, a full ring and

half-ring combined, is first seen on Phoenician monuments. This the author takes to denote the full and crescent-moon, and attributes it to the moon-goddess, Astarte. Unfortunately, as the reviewer points out, his arguments fail to show that the caduceus is really a moon-symbol; moreover in Greek art it is not peculiar to Hermes.

Mitteilungen über Versammlungen, p. 286.

At the fiftieth Winckelmann celebration at Berlin, Herr Furtwängler brought forward a list of extant works of art which he considered should be attributed to the comparatively little known sculptor Kresilas. The principal ones are: the terminal bust of Perikles; the wounded Amazon already ascribed to him by O. Jahn; a Diadumenos, whose head is preserved at Cassel and Berlin; a youthful helmeted head of Ares, the best replica of which is in the Louvre; a Diomedes (Munich. Glypt. 162); the Athena of Velletri, and the Medusa Rondanini; with three others. These works, he maintains, have distinct points of correspondence, e.g. in the proportions of the head, and certain peculiarities in the features. The sculptor seems to have been influenced by Polykleitos, though he more closely resembles Myron; and the works mentioned above seem to bear out what is known of him from literary sources.

¹ *Antiquary.* March 1891.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Journal of Philology. Vol. xix. no. 37, 1890.

R. C. Seaton. *Imitation of Homer by Apollonius Rhodius.* Defends the latter from the strictures of Buttmann.—C. A. M. Fennell. *The Iambic Trimeter.* Maintains his own theory in opposition to that put forward by A. Platt in no. 36.—A. Platt. *Homeric.* A long and interesting discussion of various Homeric readings.—R. Ellis. *Notes on Propertius* iii. 18 and iv. 5.—T. W. Allen. *Palaeographica.* The date of the Townley Homer, and an ancient catalogue of Greek books belonging to a monastery.—D. G. Hogarth. *The Gerosia of Hierapolis* illustrated by twenty-six inscriptions. Takes Menadier's view of the functions of the Gerosia in opposition to Waddington and Mommsen.—H. Nettleship. *Notes on Latin Lexicography, and Adversaria on Plautus, Vergil, Tacitus, the Latin Heptateuch.*—*Notes on the Vatican Glossary* 3321.—H. Macnaghten. *On some passages of the Silvae of Statius.*—W. Ridgway. *Caesar's invasions of Britain.* Argues that Caesar started from Cape Grisez on both expeditions and landed at Pevensy Bay.—A. Platt. *The Iambic, a Reply.*—C. Taylor writes on the saying of the Didaché ἰδρωτάτω ἢ ἐλεημοσύνη κ. τ. λ., showing how widely it is diffused.

No. 38. 1891. C. Taylor continues his paper on the saying in the Didaché.—R. Ellis. *Adversaria*, containing notes on various Greek and Latin authors.—H. Nettleship. *Notes on Glossary* 3321 continued.—*Caesar's two expeditions to Britain.* A discussion between H. E. Malden and W. Ridgway as to the place of Caesar's landing.—A. Platt. *The Augment in Homer.* Shows that the use of the augment was being gradually introduced at the time of the composition of the Homeric poems, and that it is regularly found with the gnomic and the perfect aorist; thus λάβοι means 'I took,' ἔλαβοι 'I have taken.'—C. F. Haskins. *Homeric Fishing Tackle.*—J. M. Cotterill. *The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians and the Homilies of Antiochus Palaestinensis.* Adduces evidence to show that the former is spurious and borrowed

from the latter.—W. Headlam. *Notes on the Scholia of Aeschylus.*—J. P. Postgate. *Lucretius* v. 703, reads *qui faciunt solem certa de surgere parte.*—H. Nettleship. *Hor. A. P.* 90 and 172.

Jahresbericht des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin. Feb.—April, 1890.

ON THE LITERATURE OF CAESAR by RUDOLF SCHNEIDER.

In a further notice on Stoffel's *Guerre Civile* [Classical Review iii. 192] there are added notes on the fort on the river Sègre and on the situation of Octogesa.

I. Editions. *Commentarii de bello Gallico*, Rudolf Menge, Vol. 2 Bks v.—vi. 2nd edition 1886. *Commentarii de bello Gallico*, I. Pramner, 3rd edition 1889. *Commentarii cum supplementis A. Hirtii et aliorum*, E. Hoffmann, 2nd edition. Vol. 2. comment. de bello Civili, Alexandrino, Africano, Hispaniensi. 1889. Since the 1st edition of 1857, the editor does not appear to have used any later information. *Belli civilis libri III.* 2nd edition, B. Dinter. 1888. The present Teubner text. *Commentarii de bello civili*, W. T. Paul ed. maj. 1889, and ed. min. 1889, 'every student of Caesar must study this edition which essentially furthers the text of the B.C.' Dübner more followed than Nipperdey.

II. Critical contributions. R. Richter, *Kritische Bemerkungen zu Caesars Commentarius VII. de bello Gallico.* Progr. Stargund 1889. Shows the value of β which must be considered together with α in deciding the genuine tradition. J. Lange, *Caesars zweiter Zug nach Britannien* N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 1889. In B.G. v. 8 foll. L. puts chs. 12—14 after 8 and ch. 18 between 11 and 15. J. J. Cornelissen, *Mnemosyne* xvii. A number of conjectures on B.C., B. Alex. and B. Afr. which show much acuteness and dexterity. Peter Stamm, *N. Jahr f. Phil.* 137. In B.G. v. 29. 2 venturos. Sese non etc. for venturos esse. Non etc.

III. The language of Caesar. P. Hellwig, *Ueber*

den Pleonasmus bei Caesar. Progr. Berlin 1889. Three kinds of pleonasm are distinguished, grammatical, rhetorical, and logical. The first three parts treat of pleonastic words, the fourth of pleonastic sentences. Rudolf Menge, *Ueber das Relativum in der Sprache Caesars*. Progr. Halle 1889. Careful and well-arranged. W. Ehrenfried, *Qua ratione Caesar in commentariis legatorum relationes adhibuerit*. Diss. Würzburg 1888. Caesar has not incorporated the reports of his lieutenants but has put them into his own language.

IV. Geography. H. Kiepert, *Wandkarte von Alt-Gallien nebst Teilen von Britannien und Germanien*. 1888. Nine leaves, 'certain of a good reception in schools and studies.' B. Schöttler, *Ueber die Lage der geschichtlichen Orte Aduatuca Eburonum (Caes.), Ara Ubiorum (Tacit.) und Belgica (Itin. Anton.)*. Progr. Rheinbach 1889. Maintains that these three spots are one and the same and that it is to be recognized in the remains of a Roman camp at Rheinbach. H. E. Maldon (sic), *Caesar's Expeditions to Britain*. Journ. Phil. No. 34. If Maldon had studied Napoleon's History of Julius Caesar and Heller's remarks upon it he would not have come to the conclusion he has [Classical Review iii. 89]. H. Kiepert, *Manuel de Géographie ancienne*. Traduit par E. Ernault. 1887. The part of Kiepert's book referring to Gaul is somewhat expanded by A. Longnon. C. Fr. Meyer and A. Koch, *Atlas zu Caesars bellum Gallicum*. 1889. 2nd edition. The maps are rather better than in the 1st edition.

V. Historical discussions. D. Wilsdorf, *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Marselle in Allertum*. Progr. Zwickau 1889. Eug. Fovrer, *Ephemerides Caesari-anae*. Diss. Bonn 1889. Deals with the dates from Oct. 47 to the end of the Spanish War. Unfortunately F. has been anticipated by Stoffel (*Guerre Civile*). A. Kloeveborn, *Die Kämpfe Caesars gegen die Helvetier im Jahre 58*. 1889. A criticism of B.G. i. 2—29.

VI. The Roman military system. F. Giesing, *Verstärkung und Ablösung in der Kohortenlegion*. N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 1888. [Classical Review iii. 287.] E. Lammert, *Polybios und die römische Taktik*. Part i. Progr. Leipzig 1889. Concludes that while the Macedonian phalanx stood shoulder to shoulder the Roman was arranged with an interval of a man's breadth between each soldier. F. Fröhlich, *Das Kriegswesen Caesars*. Part i. 1889. In this first part to be followed by two others F. treats of the levy of the army, the arrangement of the various parts, the weapons and other equipment and the baggage, finally the fleet and the finances.

VII. The continuers of Caesar. O. Hirschfeld, *Hermes* xxiv. on B.G. viii. praef. § 2. By a slight alteration of the text H. refers *novissimumque imperfectum* to the Gallic war, comparing Suet. Caes. 56. [Classical Review iii. 240.] G. Landgraf, *Untersuchungen zu Caesar und seinen Fortsetzern*. 1888. Seeks to show from an examination of the language, without success in the rev.'s opinion, that the B. Afr. is the diary of Asinius Pollio and that the B. Alex., B. Civ. and B.G. viii. also show peculiarities of Pollio. E. Wölfflin, *Ueber die Latinität des Asinius Polio*. Archiv für lat. Lexik. und Gramm. 1889. Wölfflin, *C. Asinius Polio de bello Africo*. 1889. These two dissertations are closely connected and support the

theory of Landgraf just mentioned, but many of the so-called peculiarities of P. are found in other contemporary writers.

Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie.

15 Oct.—E. Fabricius, *Theben* (G. J. Schneider), topographical and historical, praised.—G. Wentzel, *De grammaticis Graecis I.* (H. Posnansky), a valuable piece of work, demonstrating that the later grammarians drew upon a common *συλλογή ἐπικλήσεων*, i.e. epithets applied in ritual to the gods.—J. Sasse, *De numero plurali qui voc. maiestatis* (G. Landgraf), 'thorough.'—Bieger, *De Persii cod. Pithecano* (-χ), shows conclusively that this is by far the best codex of Persius. 22 Oct.—O. Hoffmann, *D. Präsens d. indogerm. Grundsprache in Flexion und Stammbildung* (H. Ziemer), a most welcome compendium.—P. Stengel, *D. griech. Kultusaltertümer* (L. Friedlaender), warmly praised.—F. Greiff, *De l'origine du testament romain* (O. Schulthess), 'interesting but not conclusive.' 29 Oct.—Th. Bindseil, *Von Agrigent nach Syrakus* (B. Lupus), interesting account of the author's travels in Sicily.—C. Wachsmuth, *Die Stadt Athen im Allertum* ii. 1 (A. Milchhofer), thorough and detailed.—P. Trautwein, *De prof. Plautinorum indole atque natura* (M. Niemeyer), 'learned and acute.'

5 Nov.—E. Bötticher, *Hissarlik. 5 Sendschreiben über Schliemann's Troja* (G. J. Schneider), 'sets the whole question in dispute before you.'—O. Riemann, *Syntaxe Latine* (O. Weissenfels), 'a work of independent merit which may claim notice even in Germany.'—B. I. Wheeler, *Analogy* (M. Heynacher), 'an excellent treatise, deserves translating into German.' 12 Nov.—H. Diels, *Sibyllinische Blätter* (K. Buresch), a long summary.—Tücking, *Taciti Germania*. 7 Aufl. (v. Zernial), reviewer discusses various readings. 19 Nov.—H. Usener, *Der heil. Theodosios* (Dräseke), a welcome work.—O. Staehlin, *Observationes crit. in Clementem Alex.* (Mezger), 'has laid a firm foundation for a final constitution of the text.'—G. Studemund, *Plauti fab. rel. Ambrosianae* (M. Niemeyer), 'epoch-making in Plautus criticism.' 26 Nov.—K. Wernicke, *Die griech. Vasen mit Lieblingsnamen* (Posnansky), 'exhaustive.'—A. Metlikovitz, *De Sophoclis cod. Laur. pl. xxxi.* 10 (Fr. Schubert), 'excellent and most serviceable.'—J. Bieler, *Ueber die Echtheit des Lucianischen Dialogs de Parasito* (A. Thimme), 'alike laborious and laudable.'

3 Dec.—A. Μηλιαρakis, *Νεοελληνική γεωγραφική φιλολογία* (E. Oberhummer), a valuable list of all the geographical works published in Greece this century.—J. E. Kirchner, *Prosopographiae Atticae Specimen* (H. Winther), 'will be warmly welcomed by all scholars.'—A. Bell, *De locativi in prisca latinitate vi et usu* (H. Ziemer), useful. 10 Dec.—W. Brandes, *Rusticius, de Christi Jesu beneficiis* (M. Manitius), praised.—W. G. Rutherford, *First Greek Syntax* (J. Sitzler), 'fully attains its object. Selection and arrangement of material good...linguistic phenomena are not only stated but explained.' 17 Dec.—A. Bonhöffer, *Epiktet und die Stoa* (O. Weissenfels), cannot be praised.—Nils Nilén, *Adnotationes Lucianae* (P. Schulze), 'provides a firm basis for critical research.' 24 Dec.—A. Boutkowski-Glinka, *Petit Mionnet* (A. F.), cannot be recommended, errors are too numerous.

The following announcements are made about the Constitution of Athens:—

Editions: by Kaibel and Wilamowitz-Möllendorf;

by Herwerden; by Diels (a supplement to the Berlin Aristotle); by F. G. Kenyon, ed. 3.

Translations: by Kaibel and Kiessling; by F. G. Kenyon.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Aristotle* on the Constitution of Athens. Facsimile of Papyrus CXXXI. in the British Museum. vi pp. 22 plates. £2 2s.
- Fragments of Zeno and Cleanthes. With Introduction and Explanatory Notes. An Essay which obtained the Hare Prize in the year 1889. By A. C. Pearson, M.A., late Scholar of Christ's College, Cambridge. Cr. 8vo. Cambridge Press. 10s.
- Grætz's* History of the Jews, from the earliest period to the present day, translated from the German by B. Löwy. To be completed in Five Volumes. 8vo. Volumes I. and II. now ready. Each volume 10s. 6d. net. Subscription price for the Five Volumes, £1 16s. net. D. Nutt.
- Herodotus*. Book VII. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Mrs. Montagu Butler. Fcap. 8vo. Macmillan. 3s. 6d.
- Homer*. Iliad. Book XXIII. With Introduction and Notes by G. M. Edwards. Pitt Press Series. Cambridge Press. 2s.
- Lewis* (C. T.) An Elementary Latin Dictionary, with brief helps for Latin readers. Small 4to. xii, 952 pp. Frowde. 7s. 6d.
- Monro* (D. B.) A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect. 2nd edition. 8vo. Frowde. 14s.
- Plato*. Gorgias. Edited on the basis of Deuschle-Cron's edition by Gonzalez Lodge. Square 8vo. 308 pp. Arnold. 7s. 6d.
- Tacitus*. Histories. With Introduction, Notes, and an Index by Rev. W. A. Spooner. 8vo. 500 pp. Macmillan. 16s.
- Virgil*. Bucolics and Georgics. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by T. L. Papillon and A. E. Haigh. Cr. 8vo. Frowde. 3s. 6d.
- Xenophon*. Anabasis. Book III. Edited for the use of Schools, with Notes, Introductions, Vocabulary, Illustrations and Maps, by Rev. G. H. Nall. 18mo. 206 pp. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Acta Seminarii philologici Erlangensis. Ediderunt J. Müller et A. Luchs. Volumen V. 8vo. 284 pp. Leipzig, Deichert Nachfolger. 6 Mk.
- Aeschylus*. Les Suppliantes. Drame lyrique en deux tableaux et en vers. Traduit et adapté pour la scène par P. Abaur. 18mo. xi, 60 pp. Paris, Flammarion.
- Tragödien. Verdeutsch von B. Todt. Mit dem Brustbilde des Dichters. 8vo. x, 414 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 8 Mk.
- Alaudae (Zeitschrift in lateinischer Sprache.) Redakteur G. Tursini. Nos. 13-24. 12mo. Aquila. 2 Mk. 40.
- Bader* (J.) De Diodori rerum Romanarum auctoribus Dissertatio. 8vo. 77 pp. Leipzig.
- Baerdorf* (B.) De Plutarchi quae fertur vita Homeri Dissertatio. 8vo. 44 pp. Münster. 1 Mk. 60.
- Barta* (F.) Ueber die auf die Dichtkunst bezüglichen Ausdrücke bei den römischen Dichtern. II. Theil: 'Gedicht.' Programm. 8vo. 35 pp. Linz.
- Beurlier* (A.) De divinis honoribus quos acceperunt Alexander et successores ejus. (Thesis). 8vo. 152 pp. Paris, Thorin.
- Birt* (T.) Commentarioli Catulliani supplementum. Programm. 4to. 6 pp. Marburg.
- Blass* (F.) Commentatio de numeris Isocrateis. Programm. 4to. 21 pp. Kiel.
- Bonghi* (R.) Le feste romane illustre da G. A. Sartorio e Ugo Fleres. 8vo. vii, 219 pp. Plates. Milano, Hoepli. 9 lire.
- Büdinger* (Max). Poesie und Urkunde bei Thukydides. Eine historiographische Untersuchung. Theil II. [Extract: Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaft.] 4to. 80 pp. Wien, Tempsky. 4 Mk. 20.
- Catonis* (M. Porci.) De agri cultura liber, M. Terenti Varronis rerum rusticarum libri III. ex recensione H. Keilii. Vol. II. Fasc. II. 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.
- [Contents: Commentarius in Varronis rerum rusticarum libros tres, scripsit H. Keil. vii, 313 pp.]
- Cleomedes*. De motu circulari corporum caelestium libri duo ad novorum codicum fidem edidit et latina interpretatione instruxit H. Ziegler. 12mo. vi, 257 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 70.
- Commentationes Woelflinianae. 8vo. 410 pp. Portrait and plate. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.
- Cuvél* (C.) Eléments de paléographie grecque d'après la 'Griechische Palaeographie' de V. Gardthausen. 12mo. 224 pp. Plates. Paris, Klincksieck.
- Curtius* (E.) Athen und Rom. Gelegenheitschrift. 4to. 16 pp. Berlin.
- Czyckiewicz* (A.) De Tacitei sermonis proprietatibus praecipue quae ad poetarum dicendi genus pertineant. Pars prior. Programm. 8vo. 42 pp. Brody.
- Demetreskos* (D.) Κλήμεντος Ἀλεξανδρείας ὁ προ-τραπτικὸς πρὸς Ἑλλήνας λόγος. Dissertatio. 86 S. 8vo. Leipzig.
- Ἑλλάς. Περιοδικὸν τοῦ ἐν Ἀμστερδάμῳ φιλελληνικοῦ συλλόγου. Organe de la société philhellénique à Amsterdam. Redacteurs: Madame M. Zwaanswijk, A. J. Flamant, et H. C. Muller. Troisième année. 4 livraisons. 8vo. Heft 1. 124 pp. Leiden, Brill. 8 Mk.
- Eller* (A.) De forma urbis Romae deque orbis antiqui facie. I. Programm. 4to. 20 pp. Bonn.
- Esperandieu*. Note sur un nouveau cachet d'oculiste (C. Julius Atilianus). 8vo. 8 pp. Plate. Nogent-le-Rotrou. Imprimerie Daupley-Gouverneur.
- Florilegium Palatinum sententias continens ex poetis graecis collectas ed. T. Schmidt. Programm. 4to. 30 pp. Heidelberg.
- Fröhlich* (F.) Das Kriegswesen Caesars. Theil III. 3. (Schluss). Gebrauch und Führung der Kriegsmittel. 8vo. pp. 181-278. Zürich, Schulthess. 1 Mk. 20. (Complete, 4 Mk. 60).
- Galen* Pergameni, Claudii, scripta minora. Recensuerunt J. Marquardt, J. Müller, G. Helmreich. Vol. II. ex recensione J. Müller. 12mo. xciii, 124 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Goetz* (G.) De Placidi glossis commentatio II. Programm. 4to. 8 pp. Jena.
- Hamelbeck* (W.) Die rythmischen Verhältnisse in den lyrischen und chorischen Dichtungen der Griechen.

- I. Teil. Die rythmischen Verhältnisse in den daktylischen Partien der Chorlieder des Aischylos. Programm. 4to. 43 pp. Oberrheinheim.
- Hartmann (P.) De canone decem oratorum. Dissertatio. 8vo. 47 pp. Göttingen. Dieterich's Sortiment. 1 Mk.
- Hermes. Zeitschrift für classische Philologie herausgegeben von G. Kaibel und C. Robert. Band 26. 4 Hefte. 8vo. (Heft I. 160 pp.) Berlin, Weidmann. 14 Mk.
- Herwerden (H. de). Studia critica in epigrammata graeca. Adnotationes ad epigrammata in tertio volumine anthologiae Palatinae editionis Didotianae, cum appendice epigrammatum nondum collectorum. 8vo. 158 pp. Leiden, Brill. 3 Mk.
- Hoerschelmann (W.) De Catulli carmine LXVIII commentatio. Programm. 4to. 24 pp. Dorpat.
- Homeri Carmina recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit A. Ludwich. Pars. II. Odyssea. Vol. II. 8vo. x, 360 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.
- Ilias. Scholarum in usum edidit P. Cauer. Pars II. Carmina XIII–XXIV. Editio maior. 12mo. 404 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 3 Mk. 50.
- Ilias. Scholarum in usum edidit P. Cauer. Pars II. Carmina XIII–XXIV. Editio minor. 12mo. 351 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 1 Mk. 50.
- Hymnus Homericus Mercurii ab A. Ludwich germanice versus praemissis lectionibus ex codice Leidensi excerptis. 4to. 38 pp. Königsberg i/Pr. Schubert und Seidel. 20 Pf.
- Jahrbücher, neue für Philologie und Pädagogik. Herausgegeben unter der Redaktion von A. Fleck-eisen und H. Masius. Band 143 und 144. 12 Hefte. 8vo. (Heft 1. 144 pp.) Leipzig, Teubner. 30 Mk.
- Jan (V.) Die Eisagoge des Bacchius. I. Text, kritischer Apparat und deutsche Uebersetzung. Programm. 4to. 32 pp. Strassburg.
- John (E.) Plutarch und Shakespere. Ein Beitrag zur Behandlung von Shakespere's Julius Cäsar in der Schule. II. Programm. 4to. 33 pp. Wertheim.
- Kirchner (G.) Attica et Peloponnesiaca. Dissertatio. 8vo. 68 pp. Greifswald. 1 Mk. 50.
- Kloeckorn (H.) De proscriptionibus a. a. Chr. n. 43 a M. Antonio, M. Aemilio Lepido, C. Julio Caesare Octaviano triumviris factis. Dissertatio. 8vo. 129 pp. Königsberg.
- Kluge (H.) Plan der Iliaslektüre in 2 Jahreskursen entworfen. 12mo. xi, 39 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Boards. 75 Pf.
- Kremmer (M.) De catalogis heurematum. Dissertatio. 8vo. 115 pp. Leipzig.
- Künssberg (H.) Der Astronom, Mathematiker und Geograph Eudoxos von Knidos. II. Teil: Mathematik. Programm. 8vo. 61 pp. Plate. Dinkelsbühl.
- Lorz (J.) Beitrag zur Erklärung der griechischen Farbenbezeichnungen, hauptsächlich aus dem Gebiet der Lyrik und des Dramas. Programm. 8vo. 27 pp. Leitmeritz.
- Marz (F.) De rhetorica ad Herennium commentatio critica. Programm. 4to. 19 pp. Greifswald.
- Meinel (G.) Beiträge zur Erklärung Pindars. Programm. 8vo. 33 pp. Kempten.
- Mnemosyne. Bibliotheca philologica Batava, collegium S. A. Naber, J. van Leeuwen, J. F. J. M. J. Valetan. Nova Series. Vol. XIX. 8vo. (Heft 1, 128 pp.) Leiden. 9 Mk.
- Mosler (J.) Chronologie der Pentekontaëtie. Dissertatio. 8vo. 130 pp. Erlangen.
- Norden (E.) In Varronis satiras Menippeas observationes selectae. Dissertatio. 8vo. 41 pp. Leipzig.
- Oracula Sibyllina recensuit A. Rzach. 8vo. xxi, 321 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 12 Mk.
- Peters (K.) Anthologie aus den römischen Elegikern. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Ovids. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Heft 1. Ausgabe A. Kommentar unterm Text. 8vo. 121 pp. Gotha, F. A. Perthes. 1 Mk. 50. Ausgabe B. Text und Kommentar getrennt in 2 Hefte. viii, 46, 66 pp. 1 Mk. 50.
- Phalarchi Chaeronensis Moralia, recognovit G. N. Bernardakis. Vol. III. 12mo. vii, 585 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.
- Pollack (E.) Hippodromica. Dissertatio. 8vo. 110 pp. Plate. Leipzig.
- Raab (C.) De Flavii Josephi elocutione quaestiones criticae et observationes grammaticae. Dissertatio. 8vo. 48 pp. Erlangen.
- Rabe (A.) Die Redaktion der Aeschineischen Rede gegen Ktesiphon. 8vo. 45 pp. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 1 Mk.
- Reisert (K.) Zur Attraktion der Relativsätze in der griechischen Prosa. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache. 2. Teil. Thucydides. Programm. 8vo. 28 pp. Neustadt.
- Reitzenstein (K.) Inedita poetarum Graecorum fragmenta. Programm. 4to. 18 pp. Rostock.
- Sades (Ae.) De imperatorum Romanorum tertii post Christum natum saeculi temporibus constituendis. Dissertatio. 8vo. 61 pp. Bonn.
- Schäublin (F.) Ueber den Platonischen Dialog Kratylus. Dissertatio. 8vo. 95 pp. Basel.
- Schlegel (G.) Beispielsammlung aus Xenophon zur Einübung der Moduslehre. Programm. 8vo. 26 pp. Ung.-Hradisch.
- Schlenger. Erklärende Bemerkungen und Verbesserungsvorschläge zu einigen Stellen unserer Schulklassiker. Programm. 4to. 19 pp. Mainz.
- Siet (G.) Das Prudentius Buch Dittochaeon. [Extract Korrespondenz-Blatt für die Gelehrten- und Real-Schulen]. 8vo. 16 pp. Tübingen, Fues. 60 Pf.
- Taciti, Cornelii, de vita et moribus Cn. Julii Agricolae liber. Erklärt von K. Tücking. 3te verbesserte Auflage. 8vo. 83 pp. Paderborn, F. Schöningh. 80 Pf.
- Vicoll (L.) Die Negation im Lateinischen. Programm. 8vo. 46 pp. Suzawa.
- Weizsäcker (P.) Ueber die Bedeutung der Archaeologie für das Gymnasium. [Extract Korrespondenz-Blatt für die Gelehrten- und Real-Schulen]. 8vo. 8 pp. Tübingen, Fues. 30 Pf.
- Wessely (K.) Zu den griechischen Papyri des Louvre und der Bibliothèque nationale. II. Theil. Programm. 8vo. 50 pp. Hernalis.
- Wurzer (R.) Ueber historische Treue und Bedeutung der Reden im Geschichtswerke des Thukydides. (Schluss.) Programm. 8vo. 40 pp. Radautz.
- Xenophon. L'Anabase. Texte grec publié avec des arguments et des notes en français par F. de Parnajon. 12mo. ii, 401 pp. Paris, Hachette et Cie. 3 frs.
- Extraits de la Cyropédie, expliqués et traduits par M. Petitjean. 12mo. 90 pp. Paris, Hachette et Cie. 1 fr. 25.